The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1890.

The Week.

THE currency scheme (known as the "interconvertible bond") which, it is said, Secretary Windom is considering as a possible feature of his forthcoming report, has been mooted several times since the close of the war. It proposes that the Government shall make a new issue of bonds bearing a very low rate of interest, say 2 per cent., and sell these to the public at par, and that whenever thereafter the depositors shall want to have their money back, they can get it by simply passing the bonds back to the Treasury—the interest to stop when the reëxchange is made, and the process to be repeated *ad libitum*. The principal objection to the plan is, that it creates a permanent national debt, and to some extent engages the Government to find profitable employment for the money of the people. It is true that 2 per cent. is a very low rate of interest, but it is also true that six or seven hundred millions is now invested in Government bonds at about 2½ per cent., counting the premium that the bonds command in the market. This 2½ per cent. is the rate that investors are willing to accept when they get a satisfactory security running not more than seventeen years. For a bond running indefinitely, 2 per cent. would be an attractive investment. It would absorb an immense sum of money, and the question would immediately arise what to do with it to make it earn its own interest. If it is locked up in the Treasury, it produces contraction at once—that is, it produces the very condition which the interconvertible bond was intended to prevent or allay. But the Government has no use for money except to pay its own current obligations and its funded debt as the latter matures. It cannot buy railroad securities with the proceeds, nor can it invest in bond and mortgage, as savings banks do. It can do nothing but keep the money till the bondholders call for it. For these reasons, which every banker and business man will appreciate, we think that the interconvertible-bond scheme will prove a failure, whether recommended by Secretary Windom or not.

Mr. W. D. Foulke, Chairman of the Civil-Service Reform League's Executive Committee, has addressed a letter to Robert P. Porter, Superintendent of the Census, which puts that functionary in a very unpleasant light. Mr. Porter had taken the high ground that a national census could not possibly be partisan, but that a police census taken in New York might very easily be such, and probably was such. Mr. Foulke very pertinently asks why a national census may not be partisan when its chief officer refused to have the census-takers chosen by the civil-service rules, but insisted that they should be selected by partisan "boss" methods. The heinousness of this method of taking a national census was made all the more glaring by the fact that the Republican national platform promised an extension of the civil-service rules to all branches of the public service where it was applicable. To no branch of the service could it be more applicable than to the national census, where accuracy is the first requisite. No census can be of any value unless it commands public confidence. It may serve for the mere purpose of apportioning members of Congress, but that is a small part of the information that we look for in such a work. We expect to find in it statistics of every description, which shall serve for business men to make calculations upon, for Congressmen and public speakers and journalists to appeal to, and for historians and scientists to build upon. With subordinates of the best training and of proved fitness, errors will creep into such a work, but they will be small and will not impair confidence in the work as a whole.

What sort of riff-raff was gathered up by Porter for this immense and costly work may be learned by one example. There is no reason to suppose that the census-takers in Indiana were worse than those in the country generally, since they were all chosen by the same method, the Republican Congressmen being allowed to make patronage and loot of the whole body. The *Civil-Service Chronicle* and the *Journal* of Indianapolis gave us some account of these interesting people last June. The Supervisor of the Census for Indiana selected Mr. Merrill Moores, an active politician and a member of the Republican City Committee, to take charge of the work in Indianapolis. Mr. Moores naturally gave the jobs to the party workers. The work was so shockingly done that Mr. Moores himself cried out against it, and declared that some of his appointees had turned out miserable failures. Out of forty compositors working in the *Journal* office twenty were missed by the census-takers. "The trouble," said the *Journal*, "grows out of the inexperience of enumerators and slipshod, unfaithful performance of duty on their part." Exactly so. You choose a parcel of ward "heelers" to do a work requiring education, character, and experience, and then complain of them for slipshod, unfaithful performance of duty.

The official figures of the Pennsylvania election afford an interesting study. They show that Pattison had a clear majority of 222 over all candidates, and a plurality of 16,554 over Delamater. At the same time, Pattison's total vote was about 3,000 smaller than that of the Republican candidate for Lieutenant-Governor, and over 4,000 smaller than that for the Republican candidate for Secretary of Internal Affairs. While the Republican vote this year is 78,000 smaller than that cast for Harrison in 1888, it is 35,000 larger than that cast at the last election for Governor, in 1886. In fact, it is the largest vote which the party has ever cast for a candidate for Governor. The vote for Pattison is the largest vote ever cast for a Democratic candidate for either Governor or President, being 18,000 larger than the vote cast for Cleveland in 1888, and 94,000 larger than that cast for the Democratic candidate for Governor in 1886. The total vote cast for all candidates, including Prohibition and Labor, is 69,000 less than that cast for all candidates in the last Presidential election, and nearly 109,000 greater than that cast in the last election for Governor. Delamater ran about 20,000 votes behind the other Republican candidates.

While it is very plain that nearly all the sworn statements of expenditures during the campaign, which the candidates at the last election in this State are filing under the Corrupt Practices Law, are more or less direct violations of the spirit of the law, they are still not entirely valueless. They show several things very clearly, one of which is that the practice of assessing candidates is pretty general by both parties throughout the State. Moreover, all the candidates are minute and exact in giving the sums spent for postage, railway fares, and the like, but in every instance in which a large sum has been disbursed, the amount is put down as a lump payment to a campaign committee or organization. One candidate for the Assembly, Mr. Mase of Dutchess County, declares that he paid $819.15 in getting elected. As the salary of the office is only $1,500, it is difficult to see how Mr. Mase is going to be able to pass the winter at Albany without being out of pocket. His case is typical of many others, for one of the most striking things brought out by these statements is the proof they furnish of the widespread craze for office at any price.

An amusing difficulty has been created by the sworn return of his expenditures filed by the Democratic candidate for Congress in the Thirty-third District, Mr. Bunting. He declared that he had paid $750 to the Democratic County Committee. The Chairman and Treasurer of the Committee says he never received more than $500. Mr. Bunting says he paid the other $250 to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Weatherwax. The latter says he did receive some money from Mr. Bunting, declines to remember the precise amount, and asserts that he paid it over to the Treasurer of the Committee, who declares that he never received it. The matter is likely to get into the courts for settlement unless somebody's memory is made more definite by some means or other. We should advise Mr. Bunting to keep close upon the track of Mr. Weatherwax, until he finds out precisely where that $250 went to when it was supposed to be in transit from the hands of the Secretary to those of the Chairman and Treasurer. This business

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of accounting strictly for campaign funds is a new one among campaign workers, and it is not surprising that some of them should get into complicated states of mind in trying to execute it.

Every additional statement of election expenditures which is filed by a Tammany candidate confirms the fact, already sufficiently disclosed, that the "assessment" evil flourishes with slight check under Gov. Hill's Corrupt Practices Act. The statements filed on Thursday of last week by Mayor Grant, John J. Gorman, Tammany candidate for Sheriff, and James M. Fitzsimons, Tammany candidate for City Court Judge, show that each of them paid an assessment of $4,000 to Tammany Hall as the price of his nomination. The Mayor rather ingeniously disguises the payment in his case by dividing up the amount into items for printing and circulating of "pasters" and documents, but the others reveal the payment openly. The statement of Col. Fellows confirms the previous view that the regular assessment for a Tammany Congressional nomination was about $1,000. The Colonel gave $150 of his amount to the Voorhis Democracy, thus disclosing the proportionate size of the return which Tammany made to that speculative organization for its "endorsement" of the Tammany ticket. The assessment on candidates for the Assembly seems to have ranged from $150 to $500, and on candidates for Aldermen from $100 to $200, according to the ability of the victims to pay.

An estimated table of Tammany's total receipts through "assessments" upon candidates, assuming that there has been no falsehood or evasion in the sworn statements, shows the following results:

Mayor	$4,000
District Attorney	4,000
Sheriff	4,000
County Clerk	5,000
Comptroller	2,500
President of the Board of Aldermen	2,000
Superior Court Judge	10,000
City Court Judge, two candidates	8,000
Coroner (not yet filed)	2,000
Civil Justices, two candidates	4,000
Congressmen, six candidates	6,000
Assemblymen, twenty-four candidates	7,500
Aldermen, twenty-four candidates	3,500
Total	$62,500

The price which Judge McAdam paid for the Superior Court nomination emphasizes the well-known fact that Tammany has for years obtained a higher price for its judicial nominations than for almost any other within its control. The long term and the high salary which pertain to the more important judgeships are considered sufficient reason for this. It has happened frequently in the past that as much as $25,000 has been paid for a Superior or a Supreme Court nomination. In fact, the "assessment" evil has always assumed its most extreme as well as most dangerous form in reference to judicial nominations. Nothing but explicit legal prohibition either to levy or pay any price for the nomination will suffice to break up the practice.

The banquet to ex-Senator Thurman of Ohio at Columbus last Thursday, on the occasion of his seventy-seventh birthday, was a merited tribute to a man who is highly honored throughout the country, as well as in the State where he has spent nearly his whole life. It was essentially a tribute to robust integrity, for that has been the distinguishing characteristic of the man, and the general recognition by the nation of his high qualities evoked by the occasion should go far towards compensating him for the ingratitude which the Democratic Machine in Ohio has more than once shown toward him of late years when it had a Senatorship to dispose of. It was natural and proper that the honors of the evening should be shared by ex-President Cleveland, who embodies the same sturdy qualities which characterize Mr. Thurman. It was inevitable that the speeches should take their tone from the recent great victory of the principle for which Cleveland and Thurman stood two years ago; and the ex-President's remarks upon the new Republican doctrine regarding "cheapness" illustrate afresh the absurdity of the position which the party has assumed.

The following interesting despatch comes from Kansas City:

"J. A. McKay, the Farmers' Alliance candidate who was elected Judge of the judicial district composed of Barber and Comanche Counties, Kansas, never studied law, never was admitted to the bar, and never was in a court in any official capacity. His Alliance will send him to Ann Arbor to study law for sixty days and prepare himself for the bench."

But how can his Alliance do this for him without expelling him after his studies are completed? Under its rules and regulations lawyers are excluded from membership because of their unfitness to promote the public welfare. Resolutions have also been adopted repeatedly by the Alliance declaring that farmers alone should be elected to fill judicial positions. Sixty days' study of law, therefore, while it might not make a farmer enough of a lawyer to unfit him, from the Alliance point of view, for the bench, would certainly unfit him for a member of the Alliance. Why "poison" his mind with sixty days' study of what is sure to be bad for him as a promoter of public interests? If precedent is wanted for putting Mr. McKay upon the bench in the present condition of his legal knowledge, it can be found in this city. We have eight or ten police justices on the bench here, each drawing a salary of $8,000, who were in that condition when they were put there, and have remained in substantially the same condition ever since.

It is not the tariff issue alone on which prominent Republican newspapers at the West insist that their party must back down. The Force Bill also is recognized as a case of kicking against the pricks. "The McKinley Bill," says the St. Paul *Pioneer Press*, "has cost us a majority in Congress. The Lodge Elections Bill, if its passage is insisted upon, is more than likely to cost us the Presidency." Referring to a report from Washington that it would not be surprising if the bill should be quietly abandoned, the Omaha (Neb.) *Bee* says: "Undoubtedly that course would be heartily approved by a very large majority of the Republican party. Whatever may be said in defence of legislation of this kind as an act of justice to a large body of the people who are deprived of the franchise, and therefore are not properly represented in Congress, or indeed are not represented at all, the fact must be owned that the masses of the Republican party do not believe such legislation to be expedient, while many thousands of them hold the opinion that it would fail of its purpose. Under existing circumstances it is obviously the part of wisdom to allow the Election Bill to quietly die."

The attempt to call in question the validity of the McKinley tariff because of the omission of a paragraph in the engrossed copy of the bill submitted to the President for his signature, has attracted some attention abroad, where the McKinley Bill is regarded with greater interest than has perhaps ever before been bestowed on any enactment of Congress. The Berlin *Nation* recalls a similar accident in the passage of a military penal code for the German Empire in 1872, but there is really a vast difference between the two cases. In the German case there was also, it is true, an unintentional dropping of a clause from the bill as first drafted and as intended to be submitted to a vote; but the omission had occurred before the bill had gone to a second reading. The law was passed by the Reichstag, approved by the Emperor, and officially published in its erroneous form. The error was then discovered and was corrected in a characteristic manner. The Government announced in its official journal, in the following year (1873), that *by a misprint* a clause had been omitted from the law, which should read as follows—giving the version which the Government assumed that the Reichstag had meant to pass. So arbitrary a proceeding would never be tolerated in any country which possessed a valid tradition of constitutional or parliamentary government. The only proper way of correcting the error would have been for the Legislature of the Empire to pass a supplementary bill, or an amendment to the code, setting forth the correct tenor of the law. By the course actually pursued, the law officers of the Crown took it upon themselves, by a simple official rescript, to usurp legislative functions. One can imagine how promptly all parties in the British Parliament would lay aside their differences in a unanimous rebuke of any attempt to set so dangerous a precedent. So great, however, is the German docility, and so accustomed are the German people to acts of this kind, that they accept them as a matter of course. In the present instance it would seem that a law has been upon the statute-book for eighteen years without ever having been legally enacted by any competent authority.

The excitement in Europe over Dr. Koch's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discovery continues to increase, which is not surprising, considering that it promises the extinction, or at least great diminution, of one of the scourges of the human race. Medicine has for the last twenty years lagged behind surgery, and threatened the physician proper with the loss of a portion at least of his old pre-eminence, in the popular mind, over the surgeon. Bacteriology, however, seems now to promise a great renewal of his ancient fame, and to raise the bottle once more high above the knife. For even if the Koch discovery be only half as successful as it now promises to be, it opens up a field of possible remedy for some of the more serious human ills the importance of which it would be difficult to exaggerate. The bacillus as a cause of disease has been found out beyond question, and Dr. Koch's even partial success in destroying it in the case of consumption will of course infuse fresh energy and activity into the search for the means of attacking it in cancer and many other maladies. So that we may fairly expect the next ten years to be the most fruitful in the annals of medicine.

The European papers are indulging in much appropriate lamentation over the extinction, in the male line at least, of the glorious House of Orange—the House which produced William the Silent, and Maurice of Nassau, and William III. of England, and which won the Dutch Republic, foot by foot, both from the ocean and the tyranny of Spain. It has at last come to an end in the person of the present King, who has been pronounced hopelessly insane, and has consequently been deposed, his place being taken by a Council of Regency pending the majority of his daughter. No royal house in Europe—in fact, no existing European family—has had such claims on popular respect. It is the only one which, from its first appearance on the scene, has been associated with the cause of civil and religious liberty, and has defended it through good and evil fortune, in peace and war. It has given shelter and security to many of the greatest masters of modern thought—to Descartes, to Spinoza, to Jurieu, to Arnauld, to Bayle, to the French Jansenists and Huguenots, as well as to the English Puritans. It delivered England from the Stuart tyranny and confusion and discredit, and made a bulwark for the Protestant cause when Protestantism was the sole refuge of free thought and free speech in the world. To have it end in a lunatic is a melancholy commentary on the evanescence of all human greatness.

The usual parliamentary struggle in Denmark has begun with the presentation before the lower house of the budget for 1891-1892. The statement of the Minister of Finance estimates the income for that period at 54,889,874 kr. (say $15,100,000), and the expenditures at 59,166,508 kr. (say $16,300,000), leaving a deficiency of over a million dollars. Among the proposed expenditures are 1,000,000 kr. for the civil list, and 223,240 kr. for the appanages of the royal house. The interest on the public debt will amount to 6,866,280 kr.; 10,683,413 kr. is requested for the army, and 6,794,508 kr. for the navy. It is interesting to note that, while the railroads in charge of the State show a profit of over two million kroner, the telegraph system is run at an annual loss of over a quarter of a million. The items in the budget that will attract most attention and afford material for the hottest debate are those connected with the army and navy. In addition to the amounts already mentioned, 3,598,800 kr. is requested for fortifications around Copenhagen and for certain special needs of the army, and 500,000 kr. for the construction of new war-ships. The request for 400,000 kr. for an art museum in Copenhagen, to contain the collection of statuary recently presented by the brewer Jacobsen, will also doubtless meet with fierce opposition on the part of the Radical majority in the lower house.

The chief bone of contention between the two parties is, however, the question of the defences of Copenhagen and the increase of the army and navy. The Conservatives, bearing in mind Nelson's bombardment of 1807, insist upon the necessity of providing against a similar attack on the part of Germany, while the Radicals claim with equal obstinacy that Denmark's only safety lies in a policy of unarmed neutrality. In the meantime the royal will is executed by means of the provisional law, against which the protests of the majority are of no avail. How this strange conflict will terminate it is impossible to foresee. That it cannot last for ever is self-evident, and before many years some compromise will undoubtedly be made. The influence of Berg, the early leader of the Left, is undoubtedly on the wane, and his party are beginning to doubt the wisdom of Brand's motto in Ibsen's drama of that name, "All or nothing." The Ministry, too, have for several years shown a willingness to meet their opponents half way. Under a less popular king and a less honest and capable ministry, the people would long since have asserted their opinions by force of arms; but of such violent measures there seems at present to be no fear.

Parnell's political career may possibly be closed by the verdict of the jury in the O'Shea case. This catastrophe has long been impending. His prolonged and mysterious absences from London during the Parliamentary session have been a source of great anxiety both to his Irish followers and his English allies during the last two or three years. They have never felt certain that there might not come any day out of these dark places some damaging explosion. The anxiety would probably have been greater but for his peculiarities of temperament, particularly his great reticence, not to say secretiveness, and his general disposition to solitude and isolation. It is a little difficult, for this reason, to foresee how he will take this final blow. His leadership only covers the Irish party in the House. The English and Scotch have neither followed nor consulted him, but they will now find it difficult or impossible to act with him or stand up for him, even if the Irish are willing to continue to serve under him. But it is just possible the Irish may be willing to serve under him as a sort of defiance to English public opinion. They will not feel as much responsibility for his private morals as if he were a Catholic, and they may resent English indignation over his fall as a piece of hypocrisy. For the truth is that the English public, of the upper class at least, only resents these lapses from virtue on the part of a public man when they are found out by the complaint of the injured husband. They have condoned, and are now condoning, far longer and more persistent and more conspicuous wrongdoing than Parnell's, of a similar character, on the part of a prominent politician; but then it has not been dragged to light in a divorce court. It must be admitted, too, that the rule on which they act, that no public man shall be damaged by charges of this kind unless they are proved in court, has the merit of great convenience and decency as well as of fair play. It saves them from being deluged with filthy scandal during their electoral contests, besides saving innocent men from having their private lives laid bare every time they seek a seat in Parliament. But the Irish, who are very indifferent just now to the *convenances* of English political life, may refuse to acquiesce in this arrangement, and may assume a defensive-offensive policy in Parnell's behalf.

That Parnell's downfall will have much if any effect on the political situation is very unlikely. The "Irish question" is too old and well established to be dependent either for its continuance or seriousness on any politician's life or character. It has survived a great many leaders, and will doubtless survive Parnell. The Irish as a people have earned the appellation which a distinguished historian has bestowed on them of being "the most persistent of races." That is, they, like the French, display, as a community, qualities which their character as individuals does not lead one to expect. A score of things have occurred in the ups and downs of Irish agitation during the past century to lead the English public to believe that the eternal Irish bother was at last over, but the turmoil has always begun again, the Irish demand, after each collapse, rising higher than before, and the difficulties of the situation becoming greater. Dillon is very likely to take Parnell's place, in case the latter is deposed. He will not impress the British public as much as Parnell has done, but he will do, for the eighty-six votes will follow him as steadily as they followed Parnell, and it is these votes, and not Parnell, which make the trouble. There are among them, too, Mr. Morley said recently—and he appealed to all who had served with them in committees to corroborate his statement—at least six who in quickness of perception, in readiness in debate, and in capacity for business are the equals of every one in the House except Mr. Gladstone.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ORIGIN OF THE TROUBLE.

THE regularity with which Lombard Street goes into wild foreign speculations and loses its money is one of the striking phenomena of British history. Some people are still living to whom the present difficulties in London will recall the crisis of 1825. "All the gambling propensities of human nature," said the 'Annual Register' of the period, "were constantly solicited into action, and crowds of individuals of every description, the credulous and the suspicious, the crafty and the bold, the raw and the experienced, the intelligent and the ignorant, princes, nobles, politicians, patriots, lawyers, physicians, divines, philosophers, poets, intermingled with women of all ranks and degrees, spinsters, wives, and widows, hastened to venture some portion of their property in schemes of which scarcely anything was known except the name." The speculations of that period began with Mexican and South American mines, but they soon ran into the wider field of Government loans. "No sooner," says Professor Leone Levi, in his 'History of British Commerce,' "was it understood that the State of Peru had consented to borrow, than the utmost anxiety prevailed to lend. The contractors, with scrip in hand, had difficulty in checking the eagerness of a crowd of applicants. Portuguese and Mexican, Greek and Brazilian, Peruvian and Buenos Ayres loans were in equal favor, purchasers little knowing and caring less about the financial or economic condition of the States to whom such money was lent. The loans contracted between 1821 and 1825 amounted in all to £48,000,000."

This is a very apt description of what has been repeated half-a-dozen times since, and is especially descriptive of what has been going on during the past three or four years, not only in England, but on the Continent as well. The London *Statist* has kept close watch of the Argentine speculations, and has repeatedly raised the cry of warning, and has as often been censured by the great houses that were promoting them. The crisis which the *Statist* foreshadowed has come, but, fortunately, means have been found to save the great house of Baring, the principal offender, from suspension. Probably the steps taken for this purpose are sufficient to include all the other derelicts, for it would be idle and useless to stop the crevasse at one place only. Undoubtedly the $55,000,000 clubbed together will take care of everything. Undoubtedly it was necessary that the house of Baring should be saved, lest, as in the case of Overend, Gurney & Co. in 1866, the fall of one mammoth institution should carry down a multitude of others.

The South American speculations which have come to such a disastrous close have consisted chiefly of loans to governments, provinces, and cities, for every conceivable purpose, for railways, harbors, street paving, public buildings, school-houses, markets, tenement-houses, bridges, theatres, hospitals, boulevards, public squares, and drainage, besidesbanking and farm mortgages. They began as long ago as 1881. Prior to that time the Argentine Government proper had been a moderate borrower. It negotiated loans through the Barings to the net amount (*i. e.*, exclusive of conversions) of £19,169,000 between the years 1866 and 1889, besides a net amount of £7,455,000 through other houses, English and continental. In addition the Government had guaranteed the interest on railway capital to the amount of £1,382,390 per annum. The interest on the national debt proper was at the average rate of 4¾ per cent.

In addition to these there were loans to the separate provinces amounting in the aggregate to £20,148,836, all negotiated since 1882, all bearing interest at 6 per cent., and municipal loans to the amount of £18,201,056, all negotiated within the past three years and bearing interest at the average rate of 5½ per cent. Adding the capital sum of the railway loans to the Government, provincial, and municipal loans, the *Statist* foots up £100,000,000 of foreign borrowings by the Argentines, nearly all since 1882. But that is not the end. There is a mass of "insecurities," issued by Argentine companies at home, estimated by the Buenos Ayres *Standard* at $600,000,000 silver, plus $500,000,000 of land mortgage bonds, guaranteed by the Government, known as Cedulas. All this mountain of debt rested on a population of only four millions, and not the very best kind of population, although remarkably puffed up with a sense of their own importance, as people are apt to be when they have a rage for internal improvements which they are gratifying with the money of foreigners. The situation is very like that of our own Western States in 1837.

Of course such a situation could not last. Interest could not be paid except by further borrowing, and there must come an end to borrowing some time. Last spring we began to hear of negotiations for a fresh loan of ten millions sterling. The great houses, and especially the Barings, were eager to make this loan, provided the money should be left in London to pay the interest on past borrowings. But this did not suit the Argentines. They wanted the money "to go on with," but were told flatly that they could not have it. Then they talked about leaving half of it in London and taking the other half to go on with. While this sort of chaffering was in progress, the revolution in Buenos Ayres broke out, and it became pretty generally known that the head of the Government was a corrupt rascal, and that the local banks were rotten. Argentine securities fell on the London Stock Exchange, but not so much as might have been expected. The great houses could not afford to see a heavy decline. They were obliged to sustain Argentines, and to do so they had to sell Americans. This was in the month of August. The pressure on our market soon became serious. The *Statist* of October 25 says that this selling of Americans in anticipation of the Argentine crisis began in June, that "it caused a persistent fall, and that every fall, by augmenting differences and wiping out margins, compelled fresh sales."

In September, President Celman having resigned, the new Government was authorized to add a new issue of $60,000,000 of irredeemable paper to the existing stock of $260,000,000, although the premium on gold was 190 per cent. It became more and more apparent that if a new gold loan were made for any purpose whatever, the great houses would have to furnish the money themselves, since the public would not buy a share or a bond. On the contrary, the shopkeepers, the clerks, the country parsons, the widows, and the small speculators were selling at every favorable opportunity. As security for a new loan of $20,000,000 gold the Government offered to turn over the Andes Railway and its own claim on the Buenos Ayres Waterworks. Simultaneously the Government assumed the debts of the provinces and took over the property represented by the debts; but as the Government could not pay its own debts, this confession that the provinces also were bankrupt did not help matters. The situation became so strained in October that rumors began to circulate on the Continent that the Barings were in difficulties. These rumors were published in a Paris newspaper, and although the publication was ascribed to blackmail, it nevertheless obtained a certain amount of credence even in London, where the house of Baring has been a synonym for stability for more than a century. About ten days ago it was reported by cable that a large sum in gold had been taken in London for export to South America, and that the Bank of England had raised the rate of discount to 6 per cent. It is doubtful whether any gold was really sent to South America, for the cable now tells us that Dr. Plaza, the Argentine expert, who is now in London, is treating with the Barings and other firms regarding immense operations, involving a loan of £4,000,000, besides the settlement of the national, provincial, and Cedula loans, but that he has not yet formulated proposals acceptable to the financiers. This means that the great houses are still hovering about the corpse of Argentine credit, but are unwilling even yet to look facts in the face and to acknowledge that it is a corpse. The true cause of the crisis on both sides of the Atlantic is there.

THE REPUBLICANS AND SCIENCE.

WHEN the Republican party was founded thirty-five years ago, it either then, or very soon after, comprised the great bulk of the intelligent and educated men in the Northern States. It was not very long before it absorbed most of the teachers, the professors, the ministers, the literary and scientific men in all parts of the North. It became par excellence the enlightened party—the party which had the mind of the country at its back, and from which all forms of mental activity were surest of encouragement and protection. The way in which, as soon as it became simply a tariff party, it hastened to lay aside this distinction and sacrifice all the higher civilizing agencies to money-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making for manufacturers, is one of the most interesting episodes in its history.

We cannot in an article like this follow step by step its conversion into an enemy of nearly all the instruments of knowledge and scientific progress. Suffice it to say that, in its rage for useless money, it taxed books, and pictures, and scientific instruments, in fact nearly every leading agency of intellectual advance besides steadily refusing to give foreign authors the benefit of copyright on their books, and to make any effort to secure for American authors similar protection abroad. An assembly of Gauchos from the South American pampas could not well have been more indifferent to or more contemptuous towards the claims of science and literature and art to recognition or encouragement than the Republican majorities in both houses for the last twenty years. Within that period experts in nearly every department of human knowledge have become a butt for the ridicule of Republican politicians, under the general name of "bookmen" or "littery fellers"; and scorn for their opinions has, during nearly the whole of that period, been one of the notes of party soundness.

In the McKinley Bill this scorn has found remarkable expression. The bill may be considered as the dying declaration of the party touching its attitude towards civilization, and as such its sincerity cannot be questioned. The branch of medical science known as "bacteriology"—that is, the study of the minute organisms to whose agency many of the worst diseases which afflict the human race are now known to be due—has during the past twenty years assumed immense importance, culminating in the discovery of Professor Koch which is now making so much sensation. The result of this of course has been to raise the microscope from the rank of a toy into the most valuable and important—we do not think this is an exaggeration—of all medical instruments. It occupies the highest place in pathological study and in the diagnosis of the most serious diseases. One has only to ask the first doctor one meets about its uses, to conclude that there is no product of human ingenuity more important to human welfare, that no civilized government could do too much to encourage the multiplication of microscopes and diffuse their use, for through their agency the humblest worker in the remotest village may light on some fact or indication of the utmost value to the scientific explorers of the highest rank. Well, this precious instrument the Republican party has for years been taxing *45 per cent.* ad valorem—that is, every American who has bought a microscope for the past twenty years has had to pay nearly one-half more for it than it would have cost him without the interference of the Government.

This was bad enough, but when McKinley came to look over the tariff this year, after the great importance of the microscope to humanity had been fully demonstrated, he determined to increase this tax by raising it to *60 per cent.*, so that a microscope which can be had in Germany for $94 would now cost here $150.40. This increase was made, too, in the teeth of a touching appeal read to the House by Mr. Fitch of New York, from Dr. Northrup, the eminent pathologist to the New York Foundling Asylum. Dr. Northrup further added that, to procure an oil emersion lens costing in Germany $80, he had to pay here at the custom-house $112. We must extract textually what he said about another instrument necessary to microscopic investigation, called the microtome:

"Hermann Katsch of Berlin makes an instrument called microtome, for cutting infinitely thin sections of shavings from the surface of a piece of an organ of the body hardened in alcohol. Herr Katsch is the only man in the world who makes this particular variety of the instrument. To prepare a section thin enough for careful study under the high powers of the microscope, this mechanism is necessary. To get this microtome from the Custom-house, I had to wait two weeks and pay a duty of 40 per cent. on its factory price.

"The celebrated Dr. Koch of Berlin published a report of the Cholera Commission, conducted under the auspices of the Government. At most, twenty men in this country could require this work, and they must needs pay 25 per cent. duty to get it from the Custom-house after paying in publisher's price and freight. What use would this report be to these scientists? To aid them in maturing methods of recognizing the disease when it appeared on shipboard in our harbors; to devise means to suppress it; to protect the country.

"It was to the expert work of one such scientist that the city of New York must give its gratitude that a certain steamship just developing cholera among its steerage passengers was detained at Quarantine, and the city escaped overwhelming infection.

"For Koch's report he paid 25 per cent. duty and never received anything from the city or Government."

Not content with the attack on the microscope, McKinley increased the duty on mathematical glass instruments from 45 to 60 per cent. ad valorem. Everybody knows the importance of glass tubes in laboratory work; well, the brave McKinley increased the tax on them from 40 to 60 per cent. Every one knows the value of telescopes in astronomy and navigation. McKinley has increased the duty on them from 45 to 60 per cent. His keen protective eye also fell on "raddle," a substance used in polishing lenses for microscopes and telescopes, so he put the duty on that at $1.50 per ton. What rate per cent. this is we are unable at this moment to say, but nobody but an ignorant barbarian would have taxed it at all. Every one knows the value of spy-glasses on shipboard. McKinley has raised the tax on them from 45 to 60 per cent., and to prevent cheap navigation he has raised the tax on compasses from 35 to 45 per cent. Glass disks for optical instruments he has also raised from 45 to 60 per cent. He has done the same thing by glass tubes for thermometers. Lest the scholar should burn the midnight oil too freely, McKinley has raised the duty on glass lamp chimneys from 40 to 60 per cent., and on the shades from 45 to 60. To prevent cheap worship of God, he has raised the duty on stone altars from 20 to 40 per cent. On eye-glasses, in order to hit the student in his tenderest point, he has raised the tax from 45 to 60 per cent. On all lenses he has raised the tax from 45 to 60 per cent. On hydrometers and hygrometers, "as philosophical instruments"—mark the distinction—he has raised the tax from 35 to 45 per cent. On philosophical instruments of metal he has raised the tax from 35 to 45 per cent. Noting the use made of papier-maché skeletons in instruction in physiology, he has raised the tax on them from 30 to 35 per cent.

We might increase this list, but what would be the use? There is enough here to make any intelligent stranger ask whether it is possible that the men who did these things were really nineteenth-century Americans, or Gothic or Arab conquerors, playing tricks with a subject population whose civilization they despised and wished to hinder or destroy.

THE OFFICIAL EXPLANATION AT LAST.

AFTER an unusually long silence, Speaker Reed, who was the only person really competent to explain the recent disaster to the Republican party, has told to a Portland correspondent of the *Sun* exactly how the matter stands. When one reads the explanation, one is reminded once more of Columbus's egg. It is so simple that any one might have thought of it, and yet it remained a secret until the Speaker gave it out to the press. Here it is:

"You know that when we have a really big tidal wave on this earth, it is not one thing alone that brings it about. The sun and moon happen to be in just such a position in regard to the earth, and other conditions come in to help. In the same way this political tidal wave was caused by a peculiar conjunction of circumstances. For one thing, the Democrats began their campaign in the close districts on an average at least a month earlier than we did. Republican Congressmen had to stay in Washington until the last moment, and in such a campaign as this a month's start meant a great advantage to the other fellows. Then the course of many manufacturers was to the great disadvantage of the Republican party. After the Tariff Bill was once passed and they had obtained just what they needed and wanted at the hands of the majority in Congress, what did many of them do but turn around, and, for the sake of a little temporary advantage, help to set the people into a panic about the McKinley Bill. Again, in hundreds of cases the drummers were, intentionally or unintentionally, missionaries to preach Democratic doctrine. They went all over the country with their stories of advances in prices that were to be made next week or next month on account of the McKinley Bill. But I am inclined to think that the most important factor in the result of this election was the women of the country. It is the women who do the shopping, who keep the run of prices, who have the keenest scent for increased cost. They heard in every store the clerks behind the counters explain how this article or that could not be sold hereafter at the former price because of the McKinley Bill; they went home and told their husbands and fathers, and their stories had a tremendous effect at the ballot-box."

Now, what are all these admissions but admissions of the incompetency of Republican legislators, including Mr. Reed himself, who led the majority in the House and guaranteed the success of the McKinley Bill? In the first place, it must have been known to the Speaker, and to many if not most members of the majority, that the McKinley Bill would raise prices. In fact, it was a matter of common rumor in all the newspaper offices of the country that the raising of prices was the chief object of the bill. If it did not raise prices, how was it to benefit the manufacturers, and enable them to pay higher wages and keep out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign goods? There is no occult virtue in a tariff. Its mere existence on paper does not benefit the community. It has to be an *opus operans*, that is, a tariff that works by enabling good Americans who have things to sell to get more for them than they would get if there were no tariff.

In the second place, Mr. Reed's personal experience of manufacturers and dealers must surely have prepared him for their readiness to get a "temporary advantage" when they can—that is, to watch the market and put up prices the moment they think the market will bear the advance. He must have noticed this disposition even around his own home from his earliest boyhood. The only way to prevent this, and to give the better element in the storekeeper's character a chance to assert itself, would have been to insert in the bill a clause forbidding the prices of articles affected by it to be raised before a certain date. He ought not to have relied, as he has relied, on the better angels of the manufacturers' nature, to keep prices down till the Republican party was ready to have them go up. He ought to have helped to protect these men against their own weakness by positive statutory prohibition.

Thirdly, let us ask, in no carping or unkindly spirit, how was it that the Speaker, with his knowledge of the world, expected the drummers to stop "going round the country" and talking about the bill, or, as he expresses it with pardonable bitterness, "acting intentionally or unintentionally as missionaries of Democratic doctrine"? Drummers are proverbially a migratory and loquacious class. There is no corner of the country to which they do not penetrate, and they let their tongues rattle about everything they can think of and especially about prices. Was there a word said to them by the Speaker or any one else, impressing on them the duty of treating the effect of the McKinley Bill on prices as strictly confidential? Not one, as far as we know. This effect was the subject of prediction and denunciation in all the Democratic and Mugwump papers for six months before its passage. The Speaker must have known that the drummers would hear of it, and blab about it to their customers. Very few of them, indeed, confine their newspaper reading to the *Tribune*. They read all sorts of papers in their long journeys in the train, and are the last men in the world to be relied on to keep secret anything about prices which will help them to get orders at an advance. We do not defend their conduct towards the Republican party at this crisis. We simply say that it was folly to expect anything better from them.

Another class which has disappointed the Speaker is the women. It appears that he did not foresee, when he was pushing his bill, that the women would go shopping after its passage, and go home and tell their husbands and fathers that prices had gone up in consequence of the bill. Now, how, in the name of common sense, could he have expected anything else? Was there one word in the bill, was there one word uttered in debate or on the stump, even by Mr. Reed himself, warning the women to stop shopping, or not to chat with clerks in stores about prices, until after the election? Did any one warn them of the probable political effect of their telling their fathers and husbands and brothers of the increased cost of articles of household use? Mr. Reed knew that women, as well as drummers, were talkative. He knew that they, as a rule, did the household shopping. He knew that they lived in relations of close confidence with their fathers and husbands, and got from them nearly all the money they handled; and yet he made not the slightest provision, either in the bill or in his rules, for the mischief their gossip might work.

The sum and substance of his explanation is, that if the manufacturers had not taken a mean advantage of the bill to raise prices suddenly; if the drummers had not told storekeepers that prices were going to be higher in consequence of the bill; if the storekeepers had not told the women, and the women in turn had not told their husbands and fathers—then the Republican party would never have been defeated at the polls. Why not, however, produce the blanket explanation which will cover the whole ground, by saying that if the bill had never been concocted, or pressed with diabolical and yet crackbrained persistency and blindness, the party would still be in a majority? This would have also the merit of relieving the drummers and the women from their present heavy load of responsibility.

BALLOT-REFORM IN THE ELECTIONS.

In thirteen of the States which took part in the recent elections, ballot-reform laws were in force, in a few cases for the second time, and in the remainder for the first time. From all these comes the same report of satisfactory results. There are a few complaints about unnecessary complications in the details of the law in some States, and it is noteworthy that nearly all of these are in reference to laws which are defective applications of the Australian system. More complaints are heard, in fact, from the working of the New York and Connecticut laws than from all others combined, and these two contain provisions which are to be found in none of the others, and which were added to them to meet the objections of professional politicians who refused to accept the new system without them.

The States which voted under the new system for the first time in a general election were New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Wisconsin, Tennessee, and Washington. Those which used it for the second time in such an election were Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Montana. Ten of the thirteen laws provide for a single blanket ballot for each voter, upon which are printed the names of the candidates of all parties. Under one of these, that of Missouri, the voter indicates his choice by striking out the names of all candidates save those for whom he wishes to vote; under nine, those of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Indiana, Montana, Maryland, and Washington, he indicates the candidates of his choice by placing a mark after their names, or at the head of a group in cases where party grouping is allowed. The Indiana and Maryland laws provide a stamp for the purpose. The other laws simply provide pencils. Under the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut laws each party is provided with a separate ballot. The New York law requires each of these ballots to be folded separately, and those not used to be deposited in a box provided for the purpose. The Connecticut and New Jersey laws require no accounting for unused ballots, and permit the distribution of official ballots outside the polling-places. The New York law is the only one of the thirteen which provides for the use of a general "paster" ballot, and which uses the stub or coupon attachment for the official ballots.

From no State are more enthusiastic reports of the successful working of the system received than from Indiana, which has one of the best and most thorough applications of the Australian method to be found in this country. The newspapers of all parties, with scarcely an exception, echo the verdict of the Indianapolis *Sentinel*, that the "election was altogether the quietest, honestest, and most satisfactory ever held in the State," that "the 'floaters' generally stayed at home," that "the 'trusted men with the necessary funds' cut no figure worth mentioning," and that the "law worked like a charm and has ushered in a new and better era in the politics of Indiana." A system which can accomplish a reform like this in Indiana, whose elections have hitherto been the most corrupt in the Union, and which were made famous in the last Presidential election by the "blocks of five" exposure, needs no other test to have its efficacy established. Summing up the reports from Wisconsin and other Western States, which, like it, tried the new system for the first time, the Milwaukee *Journal* says: "The popular approval of the system wherever it has been tried shows that it is a valuable one, and one which will reduce to a minimum the abuses which have grown up on our political methods." From Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Montana, after a second trial of laws equally as thorough and excellent as these Western laws, come unanimous reports that the system is more heartily approved and more completely successful than on the first trial.

In every instance, under the blanket-ballot provision, the voter must use some intelligence in the exercise of the right of suffrage, must be able in some way to distinguish the candidates of his choice. He has succeeded in doing this so easily and satisfactorily in ten States that no serious complaint is heard. In Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Montana, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and Washington, the names of candidates are arranged in alphabetical order, and the voter must be able to read in order to mark his ballot; yet no complaint comes from those States. Even in cities like Boston, Providence, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and Memphis, the system works smoothly and there is no complaint that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voters are disfranchised. There is provision made in nearly all these laws for aid to illiterates who take oath that they cannot read. Far less harm is shown to come from that provision than from the New York "paster" and separate party ballots.

The plain fact about the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut laws is, that they were amended by the enemies of a secret and honest ballot for the express purpose of preventing such a ballot. Gov. Hill's contention has been that thousands of voters in our larger cities would be disfranchised under a law which required so much intelligence on the part of the voters as these ten successful laws mentioned above demand for their operation. He opposed the blanket ballot, even with the names of candidates arranged in party groups, and would only sign the Saxton bill after the "paster" and separate-ballot provisions had been substituted. All our troubles and annoyances on election day came from these provisions. They are certain also to be the basis upon which trickery and bribery at the polls will be attempted in future elections. Neither the New Jersey nor the Connecticut law can be said to belong to the Australian system. They simply provide for the furnishing of ballots at the public expense and for the isolation of the voter while preparing his ballot. They undoubtedly accomplish much good in securing more orderly elections, and in preventing bulldozing and espionage at the polls; but beyond that they do not count for much as reform measures. The Connecticut law is the poorer of the two, and it is mainly to its slipshod and inadequate provisions that the present post-election muddle in that State is due.

It is the opinion of careful observers of the working of the new laws that they were of perceptible assistance in securing the recent defeat of Republican Congressmen on the tariff issue. There were gains of Democratic Congressmen in every one of the thirteen States which have these laws, aggregating forty in all of them. If there had been such a law in Ohio, the manufacturers in McKinley's district who have been reducing the wages of such of their workmen as voted the Democratic ticket, would never have known whether they voted it or not. No such persecution is reported in any of the States with ballot-reform laws. It is significant that loud demands are heard in Ohio since election for the enactment of such a law there. Similar demands are heard also in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Maine, Alabama, and in fact in nearly every part of the country in which the reform has yet to be adopted.

THE FUTURE OF FOOTBALL.

Football is obviously gaining in popularity, and bids fair soon to become an established national sport. A few years ago it was played only in two or three of the leading colleges; now it is established in all the colleges and in the preparatory schools. Moreover, it is getting a hold outside the college circles; athletic clubs in the cities have their elevens; and every year the game attracts a larger and larger audience from the miscellaneous public. The combination of discipline, individual skill, and brute strength which it calls for; the splendid fierceness of the game; the element of personal combat, which delights the savage instinct lingering in the breasts even of the most civilized among us—these qualities account for its growing popularity, and promise a vogue even wider than it now enjoys. There would be little rashness in predicting that within ten years we shall have in the great cities professional elevens, like the professional baseball nines, and that thousands will gather to shout themselves hoarse at the exploits of hired rushers and backs.

This prospect suggests some questions as to what will be the quality of the game when it is no longer exclusively in the hands of the gentleman amateur. It differs from sports like baseball and cricket in some important respects. In the first place, violations of the rules of the game are easy, and give distinct advantages to the side that practises them. Thus, if you violate the rules by running ahead of a comrade of yours who is carrying the ball, and harass the member of the opposing team who tries to tackle him, you help most effectively towards scoring. If a rusher "holds" his *vis-à-vis* in the rush line—*i. e.*, not merely blocks him by getting in his way, but grabs him and holds on—he enables his own half-back to get through so much more easily without being seized. This is "foul play," in the technical sense; and, unfortunately, there is also abundant room for foul play in the literal sense. If your opponent in the rush line is an effective player, it is a fine thing to disable him, by "winding" him, or gouging in the stomach, or strangling viciously when you tackle, or giving him a smart blow on the nose if you happen to know his nose is very sensitive (this illustration is from a notorious case). There is a constant suspicion by each party that the other side is trying to "lay off" its good players; sometimes the opposing rushers fall into regular fisticuffs, and in any game a brutal fellow has abundant opportunity to abuse its possibilities.

Further—and this is another distinguishing feature of the game—the foul plays, technical and literal, are very difficult to detect and prevent. When the ball is put in play, there is a confused mass of running, rushing, blocking players, with heads, arms, legs, heels intermingled; and it is impossible for any umpire to see more than a small part of what goes on. The unfair or brutal player has more than an even chance of escaping detection; and at worst, he will only be disqualified, and a fresh, unfatigued hand takes his place.

Given these peculiarities, and given also the extraordinary feeling which the college public, graduate and undergraduate, has about the success of the college teams, and it is easy to see why the game, even in the hands of the gentleman amateur, tends to degenerate into a competition of underhand play and of "slugging." Not infrequently it is tacitly understood that the referee is to close his eyes to fisticuffs, and to let the opposing rushers fight it out to their hearts' content. To such a pass had the sport come a few years ago that the Harvard Faculty prohibited its undergraduates from engaging in intercollegiate matches, and removed the prohibition only when certain changes were made in the rules with the design of removing the objectionable features. The most important of these changes was the addition of a second umpire or referee, whose special duty it is to watch the players; an acknowledgment of the absence of honor among gentlemen which gives the strongest evidence of the temptations to unfair play in the game. The immediate result was some improvement; but the improvement was not great, and promises not to be permanent. The spirit of the American youth, as of the American man, is to win, to "get there," by fair means or foul; and the lack of moral scruple which pervades the struggles of the business world meets with temptations equally irresistible in the miniature contests of the football field.

Transfer these conditions to contests between professional athletes, before the sort of public that now goes to the baseball games, and the development is not likely to be in the direction of moderation. There is so much of the savage left in the average citizen that nothing draws like a prize-fight; and if we permitted gladiatorial shows, they would be enormously profitable. If football reaches the stage in which baseball now is, it will be the slugging matches that draw, and the managers will respond to the demand. Possibly in the end its brutalizing effects will become such that, like the prize-fight, it will have to be prohibited by law. Meanwhile, the game grows apace; and the world is treated to the curious spectacle that the one absorbing question for the graduates and undergraduates of two great institutions of learning is whether eleven Yale boys can beat eleven Princeton boys at football on Thanksgiving day.

TARIFF PROBLEMS IN SPAIN.

The existing tariff laws of Spain date back in their main outlines to the revolution of 1868. Some advance out of the ancient fiscal barbarities had been made by amendments to the customs laws enacted in 1849, and other changes were proposed in a parliamentary report of 1855, and in an administrative report of 1865 A decree bearing date November 22, 1868, had put an end to the old differential duty on goods brought in foreign bottoms. But it was the triumph of the revolution that brought about sweeping tariff reforms in the revenue laws of 1869-70. The maximum duties had been at the rate of 50 per cent.; they were lowered to 30 per cent. More than that, the fifth article of the bill provided for a gradual reduction of even the latter rate, after periods of six years, until a rate of 15 per cent. should be reached. Finally, in 1883, came the so-called law of raw materials, greatly lowering the duties on some forty classes of imports used in manufactures. With this step, the movement for free trade seems to have spent itself, though the negotiation of seven or eight

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial treaties, under the same impulse, should also be reckoned in.

But the Conservatives were steadily opposed to carrying out the fifth article. They were in power when the date came for the first reduction to take effect, that is, 1875, and at once passed the law of June 17, of that year, suspending the application of the offensive article. To repeal it was their ultimate purpose, but the political whirligig brought in Sagasta again, under whose administration a bill was passed, July 6, 1882, repealing the suspension, and putting the first reduction into effect. By the terms of the same bill the second reduction was to be made in 1887, and the final one in 1892. But as the fatal date drew near, so much opposition was displayed to the enforcement of the law, the protectionist sentiment of the country having risen rapidly, that the Liberals themselves were forced to suspend the article in their turn, which they did by the law of August 5, 1886. At the same time the whole tariff question in all its bearings was referred to a Royal Commission, to be appointed before 1890, to take the entire matter into consideration.

This Commission was appointed by a royal decree, October 10, 1889, and was specifically charged with investigating the probable effect of the second reduction called for by the famous fifth article, the wisdom of renewing the commercial treaties which expire in 1892, and the question of commerce with the colonial possessions. Named before the fall of the Liberal Administration, this Commission naturally had a majority of sympathizers with the Liberal policy; yet the progress of its discussions shows that its recommendations are nevertheless to have a strong protectionist color. Even Señor Moret, who, as one of Sagasta's ministers, had advocated measures tending to greater freedom of trade, is found voting for the most extreme measures of protection. The Commission is in session as we write, but there can be no doubt that it will recommend to the Cortes the repeal of the fifth article, the denunciation of the commercial treaties, and the entire exclusion of any foreign flag from the commerce between the mother country and any of her colonial ports.

This last point, the commercial relations of Spain with her colonies, is one which has given no end of trouble. The good old way was to hit the colonists both going and coming by prohibiting them from sending their goods to Spain in foreign bottoms, on the ground that the trade was essentially the coasting trade, and yet compelling them to pay duties just the same. However, for a long time now the customs laws have made discrimination in favor of colonial imports. For example, sugars coming from the Antilles were dutiable, under the law of 1869, at only half the rate applicable to those coming from foreign countries. The persistent demands of the Cubans at last secured them even better treatment, a law of 1882 providing for gradual reductions on Cuban exports until all of them but tobacco should be admitted free in 1892; and the process being hastened in the matter of sugars by a law in 1884 exempting those from all duties. In respect to freedom of navigation, however, the colonists have not fared so well. At present, the trade between Spain and the colonies is effectively reserved to the Spanish flag by means of a differential duty laid upon goods brought in foreign bottoms. Under the law of 1882, by which all duties are to be abolished in 1892, the trade is to be regarded as coasting trade, and so exclusively to be carried on in Spanish ships. The Cuban member of the Royal Commission referred to made strenuous efforts to obtain a recommendation of free navigation, but his proposal was overwhelmingly voted down.

Our own concern with the attitude of the Spanish Government in regard to changes in its customs laws, has chiefly to do with our trade with Cuba. There is no doubt that Spain is ready to negotiate a treaty of commercial reciprocity with the United States. The personal organ of Premier Cánovas has recently so declared. The trouble is, as Mr. Blaine fully realizes, that the McKinley Bill, with its admission of sugar free, has pretty effectually kicked over the kettle of reciprocity fish. We have nothing to concede to Cuban products now, except in the case of tobacco, and there is no likelihood that a treaty based upon that article alone could get ratification in the Senate. There remains the wonderful McKinley scheme of reciprocity: President Harrison can threaten to tax Cuban sugar unless the Spanish tariff on flour and petroleum is lowered. It may be partly in prevision of this move that Cánovas is getting ready to raise the tariff on flour and our other agricultural exports. Certainly the Spanish Tariff Commission is recommending great advances in the rates on those articles. Then Mr. Blaine's dicker will not gain him much. More likely, however, the Spanish Prime Minister will act in the spirit of his remark of some weeks ago, that it would be wise to wait and see if the people of the United States themselves approved the McKinley Bill. It is probably clear to his mind by this time that they do not, and that he need live in no fear of our tolerating increased taxation by Presidential proclamation.

SARDOU'S "CLEOPATRA."

PARIS, October 31, 1890.

THE great success which Sardou achieved with his "Theodora" induced him to try his hand at a "Cleopatra." I confess to have been much amused and interested by "Theodora." The plot was dramatic, many details were ingenious, and Sardou had a fine opportunity to display his great love for scenery. He gave us a real circus, real gladiators, Christians, Greek philosophers, a Gaulish prisoner, etc. There was more life in "Theodora" than is generally found in a play which is in reality a succession of great tableaux.

Before going to see "Cleopatra," I prepared myself by reading Shakspere's "Antony and Cleopatra." I had somewhat forgotten it, and I was struck by its beauty. At the same time, I could not help feeling all the while how little the play is fitted for the modern spectator —I mean the French spectator, supposing this ideal Frenchman to understand English in perfection, but to have all the habits of mind of the average Parisian playgoer. We have in Paris an expression which is very characteristic: you will often hear a person say of a play, "There is much style, much spirit in it, but *cela ne passe pas la scène*," which means that what is too refined in language, too delicate, too poetical in expression, is lost on those who are not on the stage—the public, in fact. I shall perhaps surprise you by telling you that for a long time the directors of our French Theatre hesitated to play Alfred de Musset's pieces; and the reason of their hesitation was the delicacy, the poetic character of the style, the delightful developments which do not help the action. It is only by degrees that the public became accustomed to "On ne badine pas avec l'amour," "Il ne faut jurer de rien," etc. Musset is perhaps the only French writer who had in him what I may be allowed to call a Shaksperian vein. In reading "Antony and Cleopatra," I fell constantly upon passages which had an extraordinary lyrical beauty, but which, being useless for the action and the development of the drama, were of the class of passages of which our average Parisian says, "Cela ne passe pas la scène." And, truly, such passages are perhaps better enjoyed when you read them quietly by your fireside, when you have them all to yourself, and when they can evoke in your mind's eye visions far more splendid than anything to be seen at the Opéra or at the Porte-Saint-Martin.

When you have gone through a certain number of operas and modern dramas, you care very little, in one sense, for mere scenery, for costumes, and for decorations. It makes me angry when I hear that in such or such a piece the public applauded a *décor*, much as I admire the extraordinary skill of our modern decorators. I would not go so far as to make war on local color, or on the adaptation of the costumes to the times. We could hardly nowadays see "Phèdre" or "Andromaque" played by actors and actresses in the costume of Louis XIV. But the local coloring, the costumes, the scenic illusions, are, after all, or at least ought to be, only what the frame is to the picture. A beautiful line, a dramatic situation, is more to me than all the false splendor of the stage. What do I care for the costumes or the decorations of an opera if the music is dull, confused, and colorless? The best operas of Mozart were represented first on the most humble stage.

On the other side, and to return to what I said about "Antony and Cleopatra," there is a certain sort of lyric poetry which is hardly fit for the stage. Action is the first element of the drama, and whatever retards it or draws off the attention from the matter in hand is a defect, from the theatrical point of view. A play may be perfect in a lyrical point of view, and produce little effect on a great public; it may be very ordinary in a merely literary point of view—that is to say, devoid of any of those traits which flatter a fine imagination or a delicate mind—and nevertheless be very effective if the struggle of the human passions is well represented, if the characters are clearly drawn and interesting. In the latter case, all the operatic splendor of the stage becomes useless; in the midst of a battle we do not look much at the landscape. Fine scenery is perhaps more necessary when the drama verges on lyrical poetry, when the action is slow, when the situations do not take our breath away.

The new "Cleopatra" belongs to neither of these two classes of dramas: it has not the lyric beauty of the "Cleopatra" of Shakspere, and it is not dramatic. It is a mere succession of tableaux. The scenery is so absorbing that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you have no time to pay attention to the words; and when, here and there, you are forced to follow the conversations, either by the shrill and hard voice of *Antony* or by the silvery and melodious voice of Sarah Bernhardt, you are struck by the unreality, if I may say so, of those conversations. There is no real life or movement in them. *Antony* and the Roman generals are vulgar, and talk very much in the same style as Parisians who meet on the boulevard. The local color is thus merely external. The costumes, the helmets, the swords, the bucklers may be all that could satisfy a member of the Academy of Inscriptions; but, when these Romans open their mouths, they are deplorably modern. If here and there you are agreeably surprised by some passage, you may be sure that it is a reminiscence, almost a translation, of Shakspere.

When the curtain is lifted for the first act, we are at Tarsus in Cilicia. *Antony* is on a throne waiting for *Cleopatra*. Nature has cut for Garnier, who plays the part of *Antony*, the profile which we see on the medals and busts of a Roman Emperor; it is his only title to play the part, as a more detestable actor could hardly have been found. If *Cleopatra* does not come to the interview, *Antony* will condemn to death all the inhabitants of Tarsus who sided with the murderers of Cæsar, and who are hanging about the stage in multicolor costumes. The moment approaches; *Antony* is impatient. *Cleopatra* was to intercede for the people of Tarsus; if she comes not, they are doomed. At the very moment when *Antony* is about to pronounce the sentence of death, we hear the sound of flutes, and slowly approaches the barge of *Cleopatra* on the waters of the Cydnus, filled with her slaves and her musicians. This charming scene is taken from Plutarch, and is perhaps the most striking in the whole drama.

Cleopatra descends with slow steps, supported by two maids. I had not seen Sarah Bernhardt for some time, and her appearance caused me real emotion. How changed I found her from that Sarah who played in "Hernani" and "Phèdre" and "Andromaque" at the French Theatre! Her slender and serpentine form has become more massive. She has kept the wonderful grace which makes a sort of music of all her movements; but her face, covered with paint, is no longer what it was. As *Cleopatra*, she had her face and arms stained brown; her head was covered—almost crushed—by an immense wig of auburn hair, falling in thick locks all over her shoulders. She wore one of those tunics, which I cannot describe, which seem to have been contrived only with a view to making her look as much as possible like a Tanagra statuette. Her voice is still melodious, but there is now in it a certain sort of plaintive monotony. In this first scene, where her object is to seduce the rude and violent *Antony*, the contrast of the softness of her voice with his hoarse organ had a charming effect. She brings him by degrees to her feet; she seduces him by the mere sound of that silvery voice which utters words it is not necessary to comprehend. Racine has a verse:

"J'oublie, en vous voyant, ce que je viens vous dire."

Antony might say to Sarah: "J'oublie, en écoutant, ce que je voulais dire." Her triumph is immediate, complete: "Veni, vidi, vici." *Antony* is enslaved; he accompanies *Cleopatra* to Egypt, forgetting Rome and the Triumvirs.

The second act shows us *Cleopatra* and *Antony* in Egypt, enjoying what Plutarch calls their "inimitable" life. This act is really a mere ballet, and what a ballet! During the Exposition of last year there was a street in Cairo, with small Oriental cafés, in which to the sound of a few instruments Oriental houris danced their national dances. We have ever since been pestered with the famous "danse du ventre"; even at the Opéra it has introduced itself, but in a mild form, as if it were ashamed of itself. Now we have it in "Cleopatra," in all its impurity. A sad spectacle! Fortunately for the great *Antony*, who sits, in a flowing gown, on a couch with his "Serpent of the Nile," some Roman generals arrive and bring him news of Italy. *Antony* is roused. *Cleopatra*, who wants to see him the master of the world, sends for his helmet, his sword, and his cuirass; she helps him to put on his war dress, and sends him to the battlefield.

In the third act we find her moaning and pining for her *Antony*. She is lying (it is to be remarked that throughout the piece Sarah is almost always lying on a bed) on a terrace which overlooks the Delta of the Nile, the distant pyramids, the dark line of the sea. The sky is full of stars. The Queen of Egypt is waiting for a messenger. We have here the famous scene of the messenger of Shakspere. Sarah plays it well. She shows a sort of childish femineity when she learns of the marriage of *Antony* with the "sweet Octavia." She cross-examines the messenger, and from the few words which she extracts from the terrified slave she concludes that Octavia is short, ugly, and stupid. This is the only humorous part of the play. A second messenger sends *Cleopatra*, with the Egyptian fleet, to Actium. We find her there, on *Antony's* bed, where she has been brought secretly, rolled up in a carpet. Hidden behind the curtain, she overhears the conversation of *Antony* with his generals; they all abuse her, and hope that she has not accompanied the Egyptian fleet. When *Antony* is left alone, she shows herself to him, and there naturally ensues a duo of anger and rage, ending in a duo of renewed and passionate love. I am obliged to pass over some details. The generals, for instance, told *Antony* that *Cleopatra* had taken a new lover, in the person of the general of the Egyptian army; to convince him of his error, the injured *Cleopatra* sends for *Cephren*, and tells him that he is accused of having raised his eyes to his sovereign. He must die. She offers him poison; he is ready to drink it, when the generous *Antony*, who has heard the conversation, interferes and saves his life.

The fifth act brings us back to Egypt again. *Cleopatra* has run away during the battle of Actium, with her fleet; *Antony* has followed her. She wished, says Sardou, to have him all alone to herself, conquered, unable to return to Rome. This last act is not written at all on the lines of history; but why should we care? All the public want is to see the asp bite Sarah. The asp is a live serpent, and we have heard much about its education; the papers have been full of it. On the whole, it must be confessed that we have been a little disappointed; the serpent is very small, Sarah merely puts him in a sort of pocket which is inside her gown. She dies, as she knows how to die, and we don't know what has become of the serpent. It is late, very late; we feel that Sarah requires some rest, as we do ourselves, though she has been lying on luxurious beds of every shape, during five acts. We must leave her. We have heard enough of vague, indistinct Arabic melodies, our eyes have been dazzled enough with colors in motion, we are drunk with sensations—and we have not preserved a thought.

DEMOCRATIC ASSUMPTIONS.

I.—Vox Populi.

London, October 17, 1890.

No constitution can exist or flourish unless there prevail among the persons subject to it certain beliefs or assumptions favorable to its existence. The maintenance of a theocracy involves the belief not only in the rule of some divine power interested in the government of the world, but also in the authority of some priesthood to expound the will of the Deity. An aristocracy will not long maintain its hold in any land where men do not believe in the inequality of mankind and in the hereditary transmission of character and capacity. A real monarchy needs for its support faith, if not in the divine right, yet, at any rate, in the necessary superiority and wisdom, of kings. Democracy forms no exception to the general rule: the popular constitutionalism, or republicanism, of to-day has come into being and retains its power because the peoples of the civilized world entertain certain beliefs—for example, the doctrine of human equality and the like—which, just because they are generally received, are, except here and there by the maintainer of a paradox, rarely defined and still more rarely questioned. Things not disputed are thought indisputable, and a dogma which no one disputes passes as an axiom.

In these letters I propose to state, in the character neither of an opponent nor of a eulogist, but simply of a critic, a few of the assumptions which lie at the foundation of the democratic creed as it prevails, at any rate in England; and, further, to show that, amidst the general disintegration of beliefs which is the marked feature of the age, the assumptions of the dominant political faith are being gradually laid open to dispute. They are, through the spread of knowledge and through the influence of patent facts, rendered doubtful not only in the eyes of thinkers, which is a matter of little immediate importance, but, what is a far graver thing, in the view of men whose conduct is guided by the current rules of average common sense.

Let me examine to-day the dogma which may be conveniently designated by the name of the *vox populi;* it is, in substance, that authority rightfully belongs to the voice of the people uttered through the mouth of the majority among the citizens.

Democratic institutions can flourish only in those countries whereof the inhabitants habitually respect the legally expressed will of the majority. Reverence, however, for the will of the majority, though defensible on grounds of expediency or of necessity, rests in the main on the belief that a majority is the organ for expressing the "will of the people"; and this belief, again, involves the assumption that on every matter of importance a distinct will of the people, or *vox populi*, exists, and can, by the use of proper machinery, be discovered. This doctrine, which exerts immense though hardly recognized influence, may be stripped of what I venture to call its mystical form and be reduced to a plain and prosaic shape. The belief in the authority of the majority assumes that on all issues which may demand public decision, the mass of the citizens entertain some one predominant opinion, and that, in favor of or against any proposition which can be submitted to popular judgment, there may be found a majority so overwhelming as to represent the virtually unanimous will of the nation. The expression "virtual unanimity," just because of its inaccuracy,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

best expresses my meaning. No person capable of thought really believes that on any of the subjects which divide nations into parties actual unanimity exists; debate or agitation involves dissent and opposition. But in popularly governed countries most people believe (and not without a show of reason) that on the political questions of the day it is possible to obtain from the citizens, not indeed a unanimous, yet a nearly unanimous, verdict.

That this is often the case no observer of politics or student of history can doubt. In 1789 there must have been among the privileged classes of France thousands who dreaded innovation; but we may fairly assert that the French nation demanded the convocation of the States-General. When the Seven Bishops stood on their trial, perhaps even when William landed at Torbay, the vast majority of Englishmen, or at any rate of those Englishmen who took any interest in politics, condemned the tyranny of James II., and were prepared to curb his power just as, nearly thirty years before, the vast majority of the nation hailed with frantic joy the restoration of Charles II. There were a minority of loyalists —if Mr. Lecky is right, a larger minority than most persons suppose—who wished to maintain the connection between England and her colonies. Yet every one feels that the declaration of American independence was rightly considered the fiat of a nation. In our own days, the expulsion of the foreigner from Italy was desired by the Italians with a feeling as like unanimity as can exist in a country numbering its inhabitants by millions. Pio Nono, it is said, as against the Austrians, entertained even to the end of his life the feeling of an Italian rather than of a Pope. Even in these cases, of which a score more might easily be given, of virtual unanimity, a dissentient minority really exists; but the majority is so large that the voice thereof may rightly enough be considered the voice of the nation. From the knowledge that a voice of the nation may have a real existence, the speculative defenders of democracy, and all men who take an active part in the conduct of popular government, assume its constant existence.

This assumption is shown by the whole language, and by the very "slang" of current politics. In England, or France, or America every politician of every school appeals to the will of the nation. In general he believes in perfect good faith that this voice speaks in his favor. If his party commands a majority, however small, the case is clear enough. If, as may happen, our Tory or Radical does not find that his party is supported by the greater number of votes, then he has recourse to one of two courses. If he is a man of singular coolness and temperate judgment, he admits that the nation has gone against him; but he is convinced that, by force of argument, agitation, and the like, he will soon obtain a real national verdict in support of his views. If, as is far more likely, he be a heated and headstrong partisan, he believes that the nation has been misled by intimidation, by fraud, or corruption, and would speak in his favor were its real voice allowed to be heard; or he asserts, sometimes with and sometimes without reason, that existing constitutional arrangements do not permit the true body of the citizens to pronounce their will. In all popularly governed countries, demands for an extension of the suffrage, or for a new distribution of seats, have in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred been stimulated by the bona-fide, though often quite groundless, belief of a minority, that, were the nation properly consulted, the views of the minority, which to them seem the views of all just and virtuous men, would be affirmed by that *vox populi* which is deemed to echo the voice of God.

This firm belief in the possibility of discovering the will of the people is witnessed to by a curious phenomenon which must strike every attentive student of French revolutionary annals. From 1789 up to the present day every French party—Monarchists and Republicans, Constitutionalists, Girondins, Jacobins, and Imperialists—have all asserted, and have, we need not doubt, all honestly believed, that they were supported by the true people of France. Defeat in representative assemblies and defeat at the ballot-box have been hitherto equally unavailing to shake this faith, which, like all true faith, is its own justification. The various devices by which minorities have persuaded themselves and tried to persuade others that they represented the nation, form a curious chapter of constitutional history. Sometimes it has been boldly assumed that a portion of the people, say the Parisian mob, more truly represented the nation than the chosen representatives of the country. On other occasions a faction in power has, under the form of a so-called plébiscite, submitted the question of such faction's authority to a popular vote under circumstances which made but one answer possible. Another resource has been to enact as a rule of constitutional law that citizens who on a given occasion did not vote at all, must be assumed to have voted in the way desired by the Government. This perverse assumption, which marks at least one of the polities which have been created by the ingenuity and destroyed by the restlessness of Frenchmen during the last hundred years, has the great merit of increasing a desired majority by the very fact that thousands, or it may be millions, of citizens are so indifferent, so hostile, or so terrified that they will not give any expression to their opinions. Hence abstentions from voting which are, or may be, meant as a silent protest against a proposed institution or policy, are so used as to support the very proposal which men who will not vote intend to condemn.

The simplest, however, as well as the most usual and effective method for insuring something like national unanimity, is to treat opponents as bad men, as aristocrats, as oligarchs, as traitors, or as malignants; as persons, in short, whose voice, whose vote, and whose wishes count for nothing. This monstrously unfair course is generally taken by partisans without any deliberate consciousness of its unfairness. This, at any rate, was so during the earlier stages of the great French Revolution. Every candid historian now knows that the French people were split into parties. It is also highly probable that in many cases the faction which obtained most power possessed the smallest number of followers. The Constitutionalists outnumbered the Republicans; the Girondins outnumbered the Jacobins; and the Terrorists were a minority of a minority. The matter, however, which deserves our immediate attention is that each and all of these factions entertained the firmest conviction of being the true representative of the nation. When France, with something like unanimity, execrated the Reign of Terror, Robespierre conscientiously believed that the "good people" of France was with him. Let it be noted, also, that this faith added to the bitterness of the conflict. The triumph at the elections or in the Assembly of an adverse party was a proof to their opponents of fraud, of corruption, and of wickedness. If the Jacobins could not command a majority in the Convention, this was proof to the Mountain that the majority of the Convention were knaves, who either corrupted or cheated the people.

That this mode of argument was unreasonable enough is clear to every candid critic. But this irrational way of reasoning flowed naturally, if not with absolute logical necessity, from the assumption that there existed a decisive will of the nation on the issues which divided politicians. This assumption was made by every party in the State; each party made it because each party felt that its moral authority depended on the support of a practically unanimous people. Every party assumed that, if properly appealed to, the people would express the will of the people with unmistakable clearness. The point in dispute was how that will was to find expression. The idea that no true voice of the people existed, and that the wishes of the nation were as much divided as were the wishes of politicians, was an idea which never occurred to the revolutionary statesmen of France, and which even now is most unwelcome to ardent democrats. It is unwelcome because the notion, if true, strips democratic government of its imaginative impressiveness. The awe with which a king was regarded vanished when kings were felt to be nothing more than magistrates who held a dignified office by an hereditary tenure. We may venture to assert that the halo which in many men's eyes still surrounds a republic, will vanish if ever it is felt that democratic government is merely government by majorities, and not government in effect by all the citizens of the State. The voice of a mere majority is, as regards its effect on the imagination, a very different thing from the august *vox populi*.

Yet in England, at least, it is every day becoming more and more apparent that the will of the nation may be, and often is, divided and uncertain, and that what is called the will of the nation, the voice of the country, and the like, is, and can be, in many instances, nothing more than the wish of a majority which may exceed by very small numbers the opposed minority. The circumstances which force this fact upon popular attention may easily be recognized by any one who looks ordinary facts in the face. The unanimity which has on special occasions characterized the sentiment of a nation is of rare occurrence, and is likely to occur less frequently than in past times. National unanimity is rare because it is created only by those great crises which arise when the fate of a country is at stake, as, for example, when a people rise to shake off a foreign yoke, when a land is threatened with invasion, or when the existence of a community is menaced by some sudden danger. Such crises must be exceptional events, and the more civilization advances, the more exceptional they are likely to become. During the growth of Roman power the total destruction of a city was a calamity which any conquered State might fear. The conquest of England by Spain in the sixteenth century meant a very different thing from the invasion of a modern State by a hostile army.

Nor is it only the infrequency of great crises which renders the predominance of one sentiment throughout the whole of a political society an uncommon event. Till recent times political societies were small, or, to speak more accurately, the "active citizens" (to use foreign terminology) who shared the public life of any State were few in number, and all belonged to a limited class. The electorate, for example, of England, in 1790, represented little else than the land-owners and the traders of the country, and was quite unlike the huge body of householders who to-day control the destinies of England. But it is far more likely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a small body of men belonging in the main to one class of society should be influenced by the same conviction or passion than that a vast crowd, differing from one another in wealth, in education, and in prejudices, should on any topic of magnitude be swayed by a simultaneous feeling of enthusiasm, of dread, or of determination. We may well doubt whether, should a writer endowed with the rhetorical power of "Junius," or with the genius of Burke, reappear, he could have anything like the influence on the opinion of England exerted by the unknown author of the celebrated 'Letters,' or by the denouncer of a Regicide Peace. Knowledge and education, moreover, are fatal to unanimity; discussion necessitates dissent. It is hardly conceivable that in a country like England, where everything is now discussed, there will ever again exist that unanimity of political conviction which was, apparently at least, displayed by the English people on more than one occasion during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Diffusion of knowledge is, moreover, the spreading of light; but the more light is shed upon the details of history, the more clear it becomes that the unanimity constantly attributed by popular imagination to the wishes of a people has always been more or less fictitious. It is natural to say that England rejoiced at the defeat of the Armada, and it is probably true that the great majority of Englishmen rejoiced in the ruin of the Spaniard. But we may be quite certain that hundreds of English Papists saw in the destruction of the Armada nothing but the triumph of heresy. Historians who talk of the nation supporting Pitt in the war against France, or of the great Reform Bill having been passed in deference to the wish of the country, know well enough that there was in each case a minority, and in the second case a very influential minority, who condemned the policy which was supported by the greater part of the electors. To this we must add that, even at those supreme moments of national destiny when we are glad to imagine that all men felt alike, there always has been found a large body of easy-going persons who are in reality quite uninterested in the political contests of the day. What has hitherto been practically known only to students of history is now becoming common knowledge. The voice of the people, even when it speaks most loudly, is at best the voice of a majority; it is never anything like the voice of the whole people. The *vox populi* is, in short, to a great extent the creation of fancy; the will of a majority is, and is now seen to be, in many cases nothing but the voice of a slightly preponderating number of citizens.

In the facts I have noted there is, let it be observed, nothing which suggests that government by majorities is not, at any rate for the civilized States of to-day, the best form of government which has hitherto been invented. What the facts do suggest is, that the system of government in accordance with the will of the majority will need, as time goes on, to be defended exclusively on grounds of obvious expediency. Democracy will have to part with the dignity and impressiveness which have accrued to popular government from the belief that the decisions of a majority were always, or generally, divine commands uttered by the voice of the people.

AN OBSERVER.

Correspondence.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I desire to thank "C. A. W.," first for his courtesy, and second for offering a point of resistance which gives a refreshing change from perpetual preaching. He will please to remember that my object was to do in the case of universal suffrage what is occasionally necessary in matrimony—turn the best side outward of that which we cannot help. We are agreed that the mass of the people will take the moral side of any question where their private interests are not especially involved, and I think that the thousands who work for day wages and salaries are much more fitted to do this than the hundreds who are engaged in an eager chase after money, or who, having independent means, are less accustomed to personal sacrifice. It seems to me he does injustice to the Lancashire workmen. They *did* suffer from want of work, and therefore of wages, through the scarcity of cotton, and knew, or were told, that, if the Southern ports were forced open, cotton would be plenty; and yet they stood firm.

We are agreed, also, that while the masses may be counted on in morals, they cannot be in economics. But the inference I draw from that is, that they should not be asked to settle economical questions, but that everything should always be presented to them from the moral side. And the instrument for doing this is personality. The most powerful motor in the world has always been enthusiasm for persons, whether the person was Christ, Mohammed, or Napoleon. Even the dry science of finance would excite popular enthusiasm if identified with a man of pure and lofty character and proved ability. Now, the strongest characteristic of our political arrangements is that they aim to suppress personality in every possible way. Everything is done, by Democrats and Republicans, by majorities and minorities—or, rather, pluralities; by committees and commissions, caucuses and conventions. And yet Quay, Reed, Lodge, and McKinley will thrust themselves into men's mouths in spite of everything. Go among your acquaintances and see how the sparks fly at the mention of Blaine or Cleveland. Before, however, a man can under our system work himself into public notice, he has to do things which forfeit the respect both of himself and others, so that almost every prominent man is tainted in some way, and those who are not merely illustrate how powerless for good personality is.

Take the tariff as an example. McKinley is the accident of an hour—here to-day, gone to-morrow. The bill made him, not he the bill, which was reeking with the influence of the lobby. If his name is in the mouth of every man, woman, and child in the country, it is as that of some mysterious monster. Now, suppose that the Secretary of the Treasury, the official representative and guardian of the national finances, and of the vast interests behind them, were to stand up in Congress to give his views upon the tariff. How the eyes of the whole country would be turned upon him! None but a man of high honor as well as ability could stand the process to which he would be subjected. The weak ones would soon disappear, but by and by would come a man who was proof against attack, and then public opinion would do for him in finance what it did for Lincoln and Grant in war.

"C. A. W." thinks that, if the people showed energy and resolution in time of war, those qualities were also the cause of war and are likely to be so again. In the first place, given an imaginary line, with negro slavery and its consequences on one side, and the freest people in the world on the other, it may be doubted whether any government which ever existed could have prevented war. And yet I believe, and have always believed, that if we had had a previous series of Presidents and Cabinets who were real personal leaders, chosen by and responsive to the people, with a positive voice in policy and legislation, some expedient for avoiding the war might have been found. The trouble was then, as the danger is now, in demagogues forcing themselves to the front in spite of our elaborate checks and balances which suppress honest and able men, and deprive the people of their natural food for enthusiasm. Was there ever a people more peacefully inclined than ours to-day? If they are led into a quarrel, it will be because some Blaine or Reed, the scum of impure materials, and using the same arts which have so far served a purpose, misleads them with a false glitter of personality.

If we do not get the effect of universal suffrage and have not proper organization, asks "C. A. W.," where does the blame lie if not with the people? Can he see no difference between a spasmodic concert of action to arrest a horse-thief, or send relief in a catastrophe, and the contending with an elaborate political network which has been forming around them for a hundred years, which they do not understand and are powerless to deal with? It is just one of those economic questions which are beyond their reach, so long as they are without leaders. The legislatures, which are supposed to act for them, are not *their* representatives, but those of caucus politicians, and are, moreover, themselves in a state of chaos, and just as much in need of leaders; while the executives, who should do the leading, sit with both hands tied.

A real leader will have to make his appearance from the outside, and if he ever does, we shall see whether the people are competent for the work.

G. B.

BOSTON, November 15, 1890.

GERMAN LUTHERANS IN POLITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The result of the recent election has been studied and commented upon by every observer of public affairs, and the undoubted *causa efficiens* of the Republican defeat is found in the popular condemnation of the course pursued by the dominant party in Washington. This fact should not, however, divert attention from the side-issue which was presented in Illinois, and especially in Wisconsin, and which, though now a cloud no larger than a man's hand, may portend serious future danger to the country.

The appearance of the German Lutheran Church of the Northwest as a compact and united force in politics is an event of great importance, and justifies a closer examination of the new factor, with which legislators and statesmen, considering provisions for the future educational and intellectual development of our foreign population, will have to deal. It would be superfluous now to discuss the famous "Bennett Law," which contained several absurd and unwise provisions, and which should have been amended in any event. But the principle underlying the law, and which was attacked by the German Lutheran clergy, and especially the religious press under their control, with a bitterness and injustice scarcely paralleled in American political strife, is the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty of an American State to provide for and enforce the *English* education of its citizens. This principle, which was denounced as "paternal government" and "undue interference with the rights of parents" (upon the ground, among others, that the German language was scarcely more foreign in this country than the English), has been assailed, and, so far as the last election was concerned, condemned, by a large majority of the voters of two important States of the Union.

It is an instructive inquiry to ascertain how this majority was made up. Reference is omitted to the Roman Catholics, whose opposition to the public-school system is well known, and who can hardly be called a new factor in politics. The organization which has been most important and active in the late contest, and which in many respects now first emerges into public view, is the "Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and adjacent States." This body, known and referred to as the "Missouri Synod" by German Protestants everywhere, has now, with its affiliated synods, a membership in this country of nearly a million souls, including about 2,000 clergymen and more than 2,500 congregations. It also controls about 1,500 parochial schools. Its centre of gravity is in St. Louis, Mo., where its chief founder and leader, Rev. Dr. C. F. W. Walther, resided until his death, about two years ago. He was a man of great theological learning and considerable general ability, albeit warped by many amusing sectarian prejudices, and his successors are his faithful disciples.

In home missionary work no church organization of this country has shown more activity and greater results. The poorly paid pastors of the Missouri Synod in the extreme Northwest are to-day spreading Christianity and at least the rudiments of culture among thousands of recent immigrants and others, with a self-sacrifice and a noble heroism worthy of the best days of Christianity; and the benefits which they are thus conferring upon this country are incalculable and should not be forgotten in the criticism of other features of their system. It is, however, not too much to say that the entire spirit of the organization is thoroughly un-American, being German—and German, not of the nineteenth, but, on the contrary, of the sixteenth century.

This spirit is shown in the literary productions of the official publication house of the Synod at St. Louis, Mo., better than in any other way. The statistics of this publishing house would be a great revelation to many of your readers regarding German-American literary activity. Not a book or a pamphlet is published there but shows the intolerant spirit which dominated the Lutheran Church for a short period in the sixteenth century. The theology of Luther, and in fact everything that he ever wrote, is treasured with a fetish-like worship, differing but little from the Roman regard for tradition, and it is carried so far that in the new great edition of Luther's works, in twenty-five quarto volumes (each about half the size of 'Webster's Unabridged Dictionary'), now publishing in St. Louis, the 'Colloquia' (or 'Table Talk') is published with such completeness that all puerile and filthy remarks are preserved among the gems of thought. Thus, with all reverence for the great reformer, his most devoted disciples seem to delight in pointing to the more vulgar features of his mind, and to furnish a treasure-house for his opponents and detractors.

A series of school-books, notably Bible histories, is published, wherein the artist of the nineteenth century represents the Deity according to the spirit of the sixteenth, as an old, rather benevolent-looking gentleman, with a full beard, dressed in a long, loose gown; and this conception is logically carried out in other books of the series. Perhaps the most characteristic proof of what I may call the un-American tendencies of this great body of citizens is given in their most popular book of devotion, to wit, the Bible, with prefaces, summaries, and final prayers for each chapter, by a few Lutheran court theologians of the year 1560, commonly known as the 'Altenburger Bibelwerk.' Of this work, in three volumes, large octavo, upwards of forty thousand copies are said to have been printed, and certainly a very great number is now used in the daily devotional exercises in the families of church members. I will quote a few extracts showing clearly the extent to which this book helps to make worthy American citizens. The summary to the tenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings, verses 18 to 36 (Volume i., St. Louis edition, 1860, page 518), is as follows:

"This is an example of a particular and princely virtue which pleases God and is rewarded with rich blessings—that Jehu slew all false prophets who had assisted in the idolatrous worship of Baal, and that he made the house of Baal a draught-house. For such action appertains especially to secular government: it should restrain idolatry with all seriousness and without any mercy (*ohne alle Gnade*). For since God's honor and the salvation of our neighbor are concerned, one should not be lazy or negligent about it. God will thereafter pay (*bezahlen*) for this by a happy reign. Thus Jehu reigned for twenty eight years, and his children to the fourth generation. The Papacy needs such a Jehu, even to this day, with all its establishments and monasteries, in which just as horrible (*greuliche*) idolatry is practised as was then by the priests of Baal (*Baalspfaffen*)."

From the summary to chapter xi., page 519:

"Then there is another example, how Jehoiada, the priest, brake down the house of Baal, slew all the priests of Baal, and restored the true worship which had been suspended under Athaliah, verse 18. Such works appertain particularly to government, if good fortune and success are to attend."

Page 525-526, chapter xv.:

"Let us learn that secular government commits a grievous sin if it does not restrain idolatry with vigor, even if it [government] be not itself guilty of personal idolatry."

From the preface to chapter xxi., page 536:

"If God punishes sin in high potentates, kings, princes, and lords, we may be very sure that he will not let it go unpunished in ordinary people, such as citizens and peasants."

This Bible is to-day the officially recommended book of devotion of the Synod, these sentiments have never been disavowed, and the quotations of equally scandalous matter could be multiplied, if necessary, indefinitely. It may be added that in the official journals of the Synod, and in the principal Teachers' Seminary at Addison, Illinois, until very recently the doctrine was taught that Christianity and the Copernican system of astronomy are incompatible, and that a genuine belief in the inspiration of Holy Writ required the acceptance of the Rev. Jasper's theory that "the sun do move," as well as the rejection of the entire science of geology. (*Cf.* Charles Dudley Warner's 'Studies in the South and West,' pp. 343, 344.)

It would be rank injustice to call these vagaries Lutheran, and thereby cast a reflection upon the great body of Evangelical Lutherans in this country, who are rightly proud of their church as being in many respects the most Biblical, liberal, and progressive, as well as the largest Protestant denomination. It would be interesting to trace the causes of so abnormal an intellectual development on American soil. Beyond doubt the late tariff of 25 per cent. on foreign books has had great influence. The enlightened works of modern German theologians being practically inaccessible to these Western clergymen by reason of the price, and (to their honor be it said) a scrupulous regard for private property, even in the absence of international copyright, preventing any pirating, recourse was necessary to the old books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which have been reprinted and have furnished mental and spiritual food to the members of this Synod. Nor would it be just to class the latter with the Roman Catholics in point of hostility to American institutions. The laity probably lay very little stress upon such theories as are illustrated in the above quotations, and the second generation begins to show that wholesome indifference to dogma which is so characteristic of modern active and enlightened Christianity. It was and is only natural that an organization with such a faith and discipline should bitterly oppose the principle underlying the Bennett Law.

A knowledge of English and a consequent access to English and American literature is all that is necessary as an antidote to this sectarian virus. The attempt to translate the Missouri Lutheran views into English has failed. The only English organ of the Synod, the *Lutheran Witness*, is a ludicrous example of Germanized English in respect to idiom and grammar. The Missouri Lutheran denomination dare not admit it, but it is a fact that their peculiar views and principles stand and fall with the German language.

This is the true explanation of the Illinois and Wisconsin elections, so far as the educational question is concerned, and it behooves political thinkers and legislators of all parties to take notice of the fact. That the English school will ultimately triumph in its struggle with superstition and fanaticism is certain. It is no less true that the great benefits to this country of the Missouri Synod's practical Christian work will remain, independently of any language; and for this reason every well-wisher of the Lutheran Church will hope to see the underlying principles of the Bennett Law speedily incorporated in the legislation of every State where the condition of affairs renders such a course necessary.

I am, sir, yours truly, ANDOVER.

NOVEMBER 10, 1890.

THE CENSUS AND THE VOTE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There was a Presidential election in 1880; there was another in 1888. For the first time in the history of this country the electors, in *all* the States, were in 1880 chosen by the popular vote. But both in 1880 and in 1888 the five States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana brought out a feeble and one-sided vote, from which no inferences as to population can be drawn. In the other thirty-three States, voting in 1880 and in 1888, the popular vote increased from the former to the latter occasion in the ratio of 1.0000 to 1.2621+. This denotes the increase for eight years. Multiplying this ratio by its fourth root, which denotes the increase for two years, we get a pretty near approach to the ratio in which the popular vote in these thirty-three States would have increased in ten years, namely, 1.0000 to 1.3378.

Now, according to the census of 1880, which is admitted to be fully reliable, the population of the thirty-three States which returned a fair

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or nearly fair vote was 43,499,986—almost forty-three millions and a half. Multiplying this sum by the ratio 1.3378, the same States ought to contain in 1890 no less than 58,194,281 souls.

Some States, say Virginia and Kentucky, did not turn out fully in 1880; Maine and Florida were rather backward in 1888. Taking it all round, the contest between Garfield and Hancock was about as hot as that between Cleveland and Harrison; and, granting that the vote was brought out a little more fully in 1888 than in 1880, on the other hand, the number of unnaturalized foreigners must have been much greater in 1888, and each vote cast therefore represented a larger population than it did in 1880. All in all, the popular vote returned at the two periods is the best index of the growth in population, that is to say, in these thirty-three States.

But while from the increased Presidential vote we should credit these States with 58,194,281 souls, Mr. Porter could not find more than 53,947,361, a difference of 4,246,920. Assuming that his figures for the five "bulldozing" cotton States, for the new States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia are right, we must simply add these 4,246,920 to his aggregate of 62,480,580, making the true aggregate 66,727,500.

It is, however, very probable that the error outside of the thirty-three States first considered was proportionally as great as it was in these—that is, only 10,000 were counted for every 10,787. Adding 7.87 per cent. to the 8,533,179 found by Mr. Porter in the Cotton States, new States, etc., or 673,561 to the above figures, we have as a very likely estimate of the population of the United States (aside from the Indian Territory, Indian reservations, and Alaska) 67,401,061, or 67,400,000. L. N. D.

Louisville, Ky., November 3, 1890.

[If the true population of the country in 1890 is, as calculated by "L. N. D.," 67,401,061, the total increase during the decade must have been 17,245,278, or 34.38 per cent., and, deducting the gain from immigration, the rate of natural increase must have been 23.92 per cent. The apparent natural increase during the decade from 1870 to 1880 was at the rate of 22.78 per cent. Superintendent Porter estimates the omissions in 1870 at 1,500,000. Gen. Walker does not think that they much exceeded 500,000. If the former is right, the natural increase between the ninth and tenth censuses was at the rate of 18.90 per cent.; if the latter, it was at the rate of 21.48 per cent. It follows that if the population is now as large as "L. N. D." estimates it to be, the rate of natural increase in the last decade exceeds the highest estimate of the rate of that increase in the next preceding decade by about 2½ per cent. Such an acceleration in the rate of natural growth is, under all the conditions existing during the last ten years, so extremely improbable that nothing short of the clearest and most convincing proof would justify a belief in its having taken place. Such proof we do not think can be found in the facts cited by our correspondent.

The whole argument made by him rests on the assumption that the "contest between Garfield and Hancock was about as hot as that between Cleveland and Harrison," and that therefore, "all in all, the popular vote returned at the two periods is the best index of the growth of population." There is no way of certainly testing the truth of this assumption. Whether it is correct or not is a matter of opinion, and, within certain limits, of mere guess. Of the adult males in the United States in 1880, less than 73 in every 100 voted. If in 1888 80 in every 100 cast their ballots, there would be an increase of 10 per cent. in the vote cast, independent of any increase in population. A total vote equal to 80 per cent. of the adult male population is quite within the bounds of possibility. In 1880 the total vote in Indiana was equivalent to 94½ per cent. of the total adult male population. If 80 per cent. of the adult males voted in 1888, the total vote would have been proportionately 10 per cent. greater, and the census of 1890 would be approximately correct, for upon the assumption that the vote was proportionately no larger than in 1880, our correspondent finds that the population in 1890 is 5,000,000 (or 10 per cent. of the population of 1880) greater than the census office returns it.

Now, we do not believe that in 1888 80 per cent. of the adult males voted, and we feel confident that the census total of population is somewhere between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 below the truth; but there are various reasons on the other hand for holding that the total vote in 1888 was proportionately larger than in 1880. In 1880, after the October elections in Ohio and Indiana, Democratic success in November became highly improbable. In the last few days of the canvass the betting men gave odds of two, three, or even four to one on Garfield. In 1888 there were no October elections. The betting was practically even up to the last. The result was close and doubtful until the polls closed

Moreover, the campaign of 1888 was the first Presidential election since the formation of the Republican party in which the tariff was the principal issue. Both parties were to common knowledge divided on the question. Everywhere there were Republicans who it was known intended to vote for Cleveland, and Democrats who were openly supporting Harrison. An element of uncertainty was thus brought into the canvass which made it possible to hope or fear great changes in the relative strength of the parties in States which in 1880 no one regarded as really contested. The number of States in which both parties had an object in exerting themselves to get out their full vote was thus much greater than in 1880. The Democrats in 1888 hopefully challenged Republican supremacy in the Northwest, and the Republicans were equally sanguine and energetic in the border Southern States. A vigorous assault compelled a vigorous defence, and in Maryland, the Virginias, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska the vote was proportionately much heavier in 1888 than it was eight years before. On the other hand, outside of the Cotton States, it was only in Maine, Pennsylvania, and Oregon that there was a hotter canvass in 1880 than in 1888. In Maine, in 1880, the Greenback movement made the State doubtful. Neither in 1884 nor in 1888 did the Pennsylvania Democrats make a canvass at all comparable in vigor and efficiency to those made in 1876 and in 1884. Oregon was in 1880 a doubtful State. The Republican majority at the June election of 1888 made it certain that the electoral votes would be given to the candidates of that party.

To a certain extent the size of the vote depends upon the efficiency of the organization of the parties; and whether those organizations are efficient or not in their turn depends, other things being equal, upon the amount of money at the command of the party managers. There is probably little doubt that the campaign chests of both the parties were much better filled in 1888 than in 1880.

A comparison of the results of the census of 1890 with those of its predecessors shows that it is defective; on the other hand, a similar comparison demonstrates that our correspondent's estimate is probably about as much above as the census figures are below the truth. The great difficulty of basing any safe estimates of the size of the population upon the votes polled at a particular election must always make that method of approximating the number of inhabitants very unreliable.—Ed. Nation.]

ONE EFFECT OF PENSION LAWS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Some years ago, I was at a summer resort in the Alleghany Mountains. Not far away lived a man who used to make and polish canes which he sold to gentlemen who liked to carry away a memento of the place. On one occasion some ladies walked with the gentlemen in the evening to this man's cabin, where we sat and talked with a woman who was supposed to be his wife. On our return, we were told by the wife of our landlord, a lady well acquainted with the mountains and the neighbors, that this woman was not the wife of the cane-maker; that, however, she lived faithfully with him and no other, but they never had been legally married, for the following reason: The woman, when young, had married an old soldier of the war of 1812. He died, and his widow received his pension, but if she married again, it was discontinued, and so she neglected to have a legal marriage.

I tell this as an outcome of pension legislation. E. A. B.

Washington, Ga., November 6, 1890.

THE PHILOLOGICAL OBSCURANTISM OF ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A critic in the *Guardian* for 1877, p. 1360, having come across the word *extravagate*, objected, that "such a verb . . . ought scarcely to pass, even in a writer who dates from New York." In reply to this stricture, I immediately sent the editor of that journal a letter, fated to be silently ignored, showing that the expression impugned had long enjoyed the sanction of English literature. Not only did I point out its use by Bp. Warburton, as cited by both Archdeacon Todd and Dr. Richardson, but I transcribed numerous quotations for it of my own collecting. Some of these, given at length, or indicated by references, here follow:

"We will return to our purpose, from whence we have *extravagated*." Rev. Dr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Donne (died 1631), *Ancient History of the Septuagint* (ed. 1633), p. 16.

"A Quakeress does not *extravagate*, when she engages in such an enterprize as that of attempting to reform the wretched inhabitants of a London prison." Robert Southey, *Sir Thomas More* (1829), vol. ii., p. 323.

"In general, this is a topic on which the moderns *extravagate*." Professor F. W. Newman, *Miscellanies* (1869), p. 105.

Bp. R. D. Hampden, *Bampton Lectures* (1833), p. 543 (ed. 1848).

Cardinal Newman, *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects*, p. 178 (ed. 1859); *Discussions and Arguments* (1872), p. 36; *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (1874), p. 136.

Rev. F. Oakeley, in *Essays on Religion and Literature* (edited by Cardinal Manning), Series II. (1867), p. 159.

Mr. John Morley, *Rousseau* (1873), vol. ii., p. 305.

I now pass to the substantive *scientist*, instead of which Professor A. De Morgan substituted *scientific*, tallying with *classic*, *eccentric*, *lunatic*, etc. Though it is still reprobated by some, any censure of it is quite on a par with Lord Macaulay's censure of *saturation*. It has been condemned repeatedly. In the *Academy* of September 19, 1874, Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., palming off fancy for fact, thought fit to denounce it as being, in its established acceptation, an "American barbaric trisyllable." With truly original notions of philology, he assumed that it was formed by adding *-ist* to *scient;* a word which I have, indeed, met with, though only as an adjective, in Lydgate, Bp. John King, and Walter Savage Landor. On the ground that *scient* could well be taken as a synonym of "man of science," "scientific man," he went on to propose its admission in that sense, while, however, retaining *scientist*, with the signification of an "adherent to scients." Something like what we have in this was anticipated by Coleridge, who, from antipathy to *influential*, as an alleged Americanism, experimented with *influencive* and *influensive*, in its place. For the rest, much at one with Mr. Ellis's fashion of etymologizing, *providential* comes from *provident*+*-ial*, and *Christ*+*-ian* is a resolution of *Christian*.

Before the days of *copyist*, we had, as an adaptation of the French *copiste*, *copist*, of which the elements are, ultimately, *copi-am*+*-ista*. Again, from *theoria*, a Latin adoption, we have *theorist*, presupposing *theorista*, which is made up of *theori-am*+*-ista;* from the parallel *oeconomia* we similarly have *economist;* and *epopeist* and *hygeist*, taken directly from Greek bases, are to be dissected in like manner. Antedating *theorist* we might have had *theorize*, which would, as its predecessor, have regularly stood, at least in accordance with Greek analogies, as its parent; and so *scientize*, "to devote oneself to science," had it existed, might have developed *scientist*. However, regard being had to history, and to the scientific rules of verbal composition exemplified above, it follows that *scientist*, to import "man of science," represents the factitious Low Latin *scientista*, which is to be analyzed into *scienti-am*+*-ista*, and (except by undue utilization of the participal base, *scient-*) can be analyzed into nothing else. The merging of the final *i* of *scienti-* in the *i* of *-ist* is an instance of a coalescence too familiar to require dilating on.

Unhappy as Mr. Ellis was in endeavouring to account for *scientist* etymologically, he was no less so in designating the term as "American." The same year in which he aimed to stigmatize it by the application of that epithet, a correspondent in your journal, vol. xix., p. 422, quoted Dr. Whewell as having suggested it in his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*. In the first edition of that work (1840), we read, in vol. i., p. cxiii.: "We need very much a name to describe a cultivator of science in general. I should incline to call him a *scientist*." To the best of my information, no countryman of ours is recorded to have countenanced it, in practice, before 1849.

But certain Englishmen, under the misguidance of Mr. Ellis, or of some other person or persons taken to be authoritative, or of mere whim, still impeach *scientist*, as being a grave violation of propriety. To move their spleen against it, of course they have, for the most part, only to be brought to believe that it originated in the United States. The scholastic abecedarianism requisite for the discovery that its structure is strictly normal and legitimate, is what they have still to acquire.

Within the last decade I have, on six several occasions, written to English newspapers in which I had seen the word reprehended as "a barbarous Americanism," and what not, and have stated, more or less briefly, in its defence, what I have stated above. But all was to no purpose, as I was pretty well convinced, beforehand, would be the upshot. Comprehending, as a matter of course, the peculiarities of the people among whom I have lived so long, I have felt no surprise that, in every case, the waste-paper basket has been deemed the fitting receptacle for my contributions. The last of these was addressed, a few weeks ago, to the *Daily News*, in the issue of which for September 20 *scientist* is spoken of as an "ignoble Americanism" and as a "cheap and vulgar product of trans-Atlantic slang."

Abundant observation has acquainted me with the prevalence, among the conductors of the British press, of the specific unscrupulousness which has been here instanced, namely, the election, where they have erred, to abet the diffusion of error, by stifling what is laid before them of a contradictory tenor. Simply for brevity, however, I have confined myself to the suppressions of the *Guardian* and the *Daily News*, typical specimens, respectively, of a high-class religious newspaper and a secular. As to the delinquencies which have been brought home to their editors, they can admit of but one explanation. The reputation of those editors for accuracy, especially where a topic of such general interest as our language is concerned, must be upheld, be the event what it may; and writers on their staffs are, accordingly, to be protected, by whatever measures, from the imputation of fallibility. To this end, as the readiest of all possible devices, what they have once put forth must remain uncontroverted; and, if it happens not to be the truth, why, so much the worse for the truth. The obvious comment on this is, that different ethics from those which are practically inveracious ought, surely, to be expected from the spokesmen of a nation that plumes itself on its hatred of mendacity.

As is well known, our characteristic deviations from the standard speech of Great Britain are admitted to constitute one of the grounds for the scornful aversion to us which Englishmen entertain so widely. At the same time, very few Englishmen have qualified themselves, to any notable extent, to speak as critical philologists. What with their dislike of us and their want of conversance with literature, the result, then, is, that any chance solecism of phraseology, or unfamiliar vocable, which they light upon is, too often, at once decided, by many of them, to be an Americanism. Nor, from its ministering to what it is esteemed so desirable to encourage, animosity, is the decision lightly to be revoked, though ever so clearly made out to be groundless. A demonstration to this effect is, therefore, certain to be resented, in some way or other, above all if its author is one of ourselves. More than this, Englishmen, as I have learned from nearly half a century of intercourse with them on their own soil, not only, as a rule, are difficult to persuade that an American can have a decent acquaintance with the English language, but not seldom receive with marked contempt, or as a personal affront, any remark on the subject that he may happen to offer.—Your obedient servant, F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, October 28, 1890.

HONEST ANSWERS TO HONEST INQUIRIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have been a reader of the *Nation* for several years, and, although reared among hard-shell protectionists, I have admired its sound treatment of the tariff. Since it is preeminently a question on which a newspaper ought to be fair and reliable, ought to admit *some* truth on the other side, ought, as it were, to swear to its own hurt and change not, I trust you will answer an honest question or two.

(1.) How, in No. 1320, does the "dealer in pearl buttons," whom you quote in an editorial, make out the additional duty under the McKinley tariff on 1,473 gross to be $754 80? In my copy of the bill the additional duty is said to be two cents—but two cents per what? $754.80 on 1,473 gross is equivalent to about two cents per half dozen. Is the rule of measurement too complex for the lay mind?

(2.) Can you mention any men, heads of firms announcing the rise in prices since October 6, that vote the Republican ticket?

Yours with respect, THOS. W. SMITH.

MINNEAPOLIS, November 12, 1890.

[Pearl buttons are sold by the gross. The old duty was 25 per cent. ad valorem. The new duty is 25 per cent. ad valorem plus 2½ cents per line per gross. The line is one-fortieth of an inch. If the diameter of a pearl button is half an inch, *i. e.*, twenty lines, the duty is 50 cents per gross plus 25 per cent. ad valorem. The cost in Vienna of an invoice of 9,528 gross of pearl buttons, recently published in the newspapers (the sizes running from eleven lines to thirty lines), was $1,519, an average of 13$\frac{3}{10}$ cents per gross. The duty on the entire invoice under the old tariff would have been $379.75. Under the McKinley Tariff the lines were measured and counted. They footed up 184,220 gross-lines. At 2½ cents per line, the specific duty was $4,605.50. Add to this the ad-valorem duty of 25 per cent. and we have a total duty of $4,985.25 on $1,519 worth of property, or about 350 per cent. On the cheaper grades of pearl buttons the duty is much higher, being equal in some cases to 1,400 per cent. The result is that the mother of a family who paid say 2 cents for a dozen pearl buttons must now pay about 7 cents for the same quantity.

Among the firms that have, since October 6, announced an early advance of prices, may be mentioned John Wanamaker and J. & J. Dobson of Philadelphia, the former in tinware and the latter in carpets. Both these houses are prominently identified with the Republican party.—ED. NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VANDALISM IN EGYPT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The names of Englishmen are being solicited to a petition to the British Government to use its great influence with the Egyptian Government to put a stop to the illegal and shocking mutilation of the monuments and sculptures of old Egypt. It is in the power of England to accomplish much. A list of American names will be forwarded by me to the British Museum, to be placed in the proper hands, and I ask for signatures from our people for that petition. Will not our press state this fact?—Most faithfully yours,

Wm. C. Winslow,
Vice-President of the Egypt Exploration Fund.

Boston, 525 Beacon Street, Nov. 17, 1890.

Notes.

Henry Holt & Co. have nearly ready an illustrated work, 'Greek Literature,' by Thomas Sargeant Perry, forming an octavo volume of some 900 pages.

Harper & Brothers will publish immediately 'Strolls by Starlight and Sunshine,' a sumptuous volume written and illustrated by William Hamilton Gibson; 'Curiosities of the American Stage,' by Laurence Hutton, and 'Ten Tales' by François Coppée, translated by Walter Learned.

'Voces Populi' is the title given by F. Anstey, the humorous author of the 'Tinted Venus,' to a series of overheard conversations excerpted from *Punch*, to which Mr. Anstey is a contributor. Longmans, Green & Co. will shortly issue it.

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. will publish immediately the Cabinet Edition of 'Jesus, the Messiah,' by Alfred Edersheim; 'Unknown Switzerland,' by Victor Tissot; 'Aunt Dorothy,' an Old Virginia plantation story, by Margaret J. Preston; 'Etchings in Verse,' by Charles Lemuel Thompson; 'The Variations of Calvinism,' by Henry J. Van Dyke; 'Our Father's Kingdom,' by Julius H. Seelye; 'The Hittites: Their Inscriptions and Their History,' by John Campbell, M.A.

An illustrated Biography of Isaac Pitman of Bath, the inventor of Phonography, by Thomas Allen Reed, will be published on December 1 by Griffith, Farran & Co., London. Mr. Pitman, who is in his seventy-eighth year, still presides over the Phonetic Institute at Bath, which he has superintended uninterruptedly for more than half a century.

'Gipsy: the Story of a Dog,' by Mrs. Helen E. Starrett, is to be reprinted in a volume by Searle & Gorton, Chicago—a firm of women, by the way.

'Ways and Means,' by the Rev. F. E. Clark, President of the United Societies of Christian Endeavor, is in the press of D. Lothrop Co., Boston. It treats of the organization and conduct of these societies.

Henry Carey Baird & Co., Philadelphia, are about to bring out in a volume the essays on 'Road-Making and Maintenance' awarded the prizes offered through the University of Pennsylvania by the "Committee on Better Roads" of Philadelphia. Such a work deserves a wide circulation.

Col. T. W. Higginson's first recreation after the war was a revision of Mrs. Elizabeth Carter's standard (and at that time only) English translation of the Works of Epictetus. The result of his labors appeared in 1865, and was reviewed by us at the time. Through the same publishers (Little, Brown & Co.), he now prints a new edition, in two volumes, in response to a gratifying demand. The interval has been so well improved that, as Mr. Higginson says in his new preface, his translation "now bears few traces of Mrs. Carter's." For this reason one would have been glad to see, in this handsome edition, a trace of the good lady and good scholar herself—say a copy of Sir Thomas Lawrence's drawing of her in the National Portrait Gallery. There is no need to recommend these volumes for their contents, or as a permanently choice and suitable gift.

Gebbie & Co. of Philadelphia have published a handsome quarto volume, entitled 'At Susa,' by Mme. Jane Dieulafoy, translated from the French by Frank Linstow White. Mme. Dieulafoy assisted her husband in one of the most successful pieces of archæological work executed in modern times, and this may be said while the full historical value of their labors is not yet apparent. 'At Susa' does not present the serious results, but is simply an entertaining diary of the travel and incidents which attended the two years spent in Persia.

The genesis of the two bulky volumes containing the 'Complete Poetical Works of John Milton' which come to us from the same publishers, may thus be set forth: The quarto size was adopted for the sake of the ancient plates (after Martin, Westall, Flatters, Frost, Bida, etc.), here reproduced by photogravure; the text and notes were borrowed from Bishop Thomas Newton, his edition being at a safe distance of one hundred and fifty years. To all this there would be no objection, but the publishers both misname their "India proof edition," and put it forward as, "on the whole, . . . the best that has ever appeared." Prof. Masson's edition, which we noticed a week ago, furnishes the answer to such a pretension, as regards text or notes or size, if Milton is to be read, and not kept to lumber up the drawing-room table.

The garish all-gold cover of 'The Poet's Year' (Boston: D. Lothrop Co.) repels acquaintance with the really good body of selections, in the sequence of the calendar, which Mr. Oscar Fay Adams has here got together. The scheme of this oblong, well-printed volume is, nearly enough, a dozen leaves to each of the twelve months, with illustrations regularly interspersed, not unpleasingly. It would, of course, be easy to make as large a volume, if not as good, out of what regard for the law of copyright or editorial oversight has omitted. Perhaps one might not succeed better with November in finding verse in which the month's name is actually introduced; Mr. Adams fills up freely with Indian Summer. Under this rubric we miss Tom Hood's negative "No-vember," and indeed Mr. Adams quite eschews the humorous, so far as we have observed, else he might have reinforced Lowell's "May is a pious fraud of the almanac" with Cowper's skit on the same theme, in which May pinches blue the scribbling fingers of the poetic hacks who continue to chant her praises rather than those of her next younger sister.

Another, and to us a novel, principle of verse selection is followed in Elizabeth A. Allen's "'Gold Nails' to Hang Memories On' (T. Y. Crowell & Co.), in which Christian names of men and women replace the names of the months in the preceding collection, and a blank space after each name enables the owner of the book to make an autograph album of it. Here, as with Mr. Adams's series, it is easy to suggest omissions—under Lawrence, for example, the Miltonian sonnet begun with that prænomen, and the same poet's "Daughter to that good Earl," under Margaret; under Lucy, Wordsworth's classic lines, and under Thomas, his sonnet to Clarkson; under Patrick, Coleridge's "Dejection," and under Arthur, "Where is the grave of Sir Arthur O'Kellyn?" etc. In fact, there is a needless amount of rhymes expressly made to eke out the gallery, as in the case of Cora, Corinne, where Herrick was ready to stand in the gap. A special index gathers together the historical characters commemorated.

In 'The Day's Message' (Boston: Roberts Bros.) we have a spiritual diary chosen and arranged by "Susan Coolidge," with Job, the Psalms, Tennyson, and Marcus Aurelius on the first page. Fitness to the date is observed where possible, and the compiler's standard is refined and even, as was to be expected.

A companionable little 'Pocket Volume of Selections from the Poetical Works of Robert Browning' has just been issued in London by Smith & Elder (New York: Scribner & Welford). It comprises only the lyrical product of the dead poet, ending with the inspiring epilogue to 'Asolando.'

The indefatigible editor of Thoreau, Mr. H. G. O. Blake, has gathered from his various volumes a little book of selections, 'Thoreau's Thoughts' (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), to which is appended a very full bibliography of Thoreau's writings and of criticisms upon him. Thoreau was occasionally a coiner of epigrams, but not sufficiently often to make a reputation as a writer of "thoughts," which must always be judged by the French standard. In his books the current of thought sometimes eddies into a felicity which sums up what has gone before and flashes it out, but the effect is due to the rarity of its occurrence. This volume, therefore, cannot add to Thoreau's reputation, but it may assist in making his works more sought for. The subjects are mainly the inner life, the influences of nature, the dissipation of society; friendship, love, and the sense of the divine element in our lives. They are not treated with that condensation and sharpness which results in maxims or popular quotations, but they illustrate the unity and constancy of Thoreau's mood and his way of taking life. To read a few continuous pages of his volumes, however, would give a better impression of his talent and the peculiarities of his temperament.

The convenient Stott Library does a real service to those with a taste for good literature by including in the series the 'Familiar Letters of James Howell,' edited by Mr. Bennett in two volumes. The introduction is careful and not too long, and the letters themselves are the most agreeable of unlaborious reading, being in the main an intelligent and interested traveller's account of the sights of the Continent and its political news in the first Stuart period, told with a personal touch and often a warmth of friendship that are charming. France, Italy, Spain, and the Low Countries are the ground traversed. The volumes, it should be said, though the editor omits to do so, contain only a portion of the letters; the appearance of the rest, we are told elsewhere, will depend on the public's reception of the present venture.

The eleventh volume of the "Carisbrooke Library" (George Routledge & Sons) consists mainly of 'Gulliver's Travels,' reprinted with great fidelity from the first edition. To these Prof. Morley adds for comparison an account of Cyrano de Bergerac and his 'Voyages to the Sun and Moon,' and sundry small pieces of Swift, including his "Essay on Modern Education," "Hints towards an Essay on Conversation," and "Letter of Advice to a Young Poet."

Tales and romances, original and from the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German, "Klosterheim" leading off and Tieck's "Love Charm" closing the collection, fill the twelfth volume of Masson's edition of De Quincey's writings (Macmillan). They have been got together with no little labor, and several are not to be found in any other collective edition.

The general scrappiness which characterizes the *Bookworm*, and is all the more noticeable when the series is bound up, is relieved in the third volume (A. C. Armstrong & Son) by four papers, by W. Roberts, giving a history of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The obituary notice of the late lamented William Blades is accompanied by a portrait, and there is a full-length of Mr. F. Locker Lampson in connection with an account of his Rowfant Library. A number of other illustrations are scattered through the volume, over which one may pass an idle hour with some amusement, some instruction, and no expenditure of thought.

Goldthwaite's Geographical Magazine is a new periodical that will make its appearance in this city on January 1, embellished with maps and illustrations (W. M. & J. C. Goldthwaite). The freshest news of exploration and discovery is promised. Each volume will be indexed.

Mr. W. M. Griswold's latest novelty in his useful line of aids to readers and students is a little 'Continuous Index,' of pocket size, issued since October 1. Upwards of forty periodicals are kept the run of. Mr. Griswold, whose address is Cambridge, Mass., desires early subscriptions with a view to the securing of pound rates of postage.

Readers of *Science* have, during several months past, given some attention to a series of articles on meteorological questions by Prof. H. A. Hazen of the Signal Service, from whom, as has been remarked abroad, *Science* takes its tone on these matters. Most of the articles have been reprinted in book form under the name of 'The Tornado,' of which a brief notice has appeared in our columns. Since then we have received two essays which show how completely Prof. Hazen's views are repudiated by other meteorologists. The first is by Dr. Julius Hann of Vienna, the leading meteorologist of Europe, in the *Meteorologische Zeitschrift* for September. The second is by Prof. William Ferrel, the most eminent of American meteorologists, in the *American Meteorological Journal* for November. The same writer had already sent a note to *Science* for October 3; and he now again briefly shows how completely Prof. Hazen has been in the wrong in certain of his fundamental statements. It is not likely that many readers have been seriously affected by the latter's errors, but if they have, it would be well for them to refer to the papers by Ferrel and Hann.

In the eleventh annual report of the Harvard "Annex," there is very gratifying evidence of the service which this institution renders to young women capable of assuming professorial duties in other colleges devoted to their sex, especially since instruction in astronomy has been afforded. Among graduates who have distinguished themselves by special investigations is cited Miss Marion Harwood Gleason, who has produced a monograph on the legislation, colonial and later, respecting fugitive apprentices and slaves, that will shortly be printed. Funds for insuring like publications are solicited. The first scholarship has been established, and two new prizes (for a translation from Dante and an essay on him) announced. Dr. Sargent's prize for a metrical translation from Horace, won last year by Miss Helen L. Read in competition with the Harvard undergraduates, is renewed. In all respects the Annex is in a prosperous condition.

Miss Bruce's gift of $6,000 to the Harvard Observatory in aid of astronomical research has been distributed on both sides of the Atlantic, as just announced by Prof. Pickering, who reports several deserving cases that could not be reached, and asks for further gifts, of which the results "would be very far-reaching, and would be attained without delay."

The College of Physicians of Philadelphia invites essays on any subject in medicine, to be sent in before May 1, 1891, in competition for the Alvarenga prize (about $180).

The International Congress of Americanists met this year in Paris for a session of six days, beginning on October 15. M. de Quatrefages of the Institute delivered the opening address, in which he maintained with ardor the thesis that it was by immigration only and not at all by autochthonism that the American continent had been peopled. The second day's sitting was taken up largely by a consideration of the question, now grown wearisome, of an indigenous origin of the name America. By a nearly unanimous vote the Congress decided that this theory ought to be set aside, and that the question ought not to figure hereafter on any order of the day. On the last day there was a most lively debate upon the vexed question of the priority of discovery of America, which everybody will like to read. The next session of the Congress will be held in 1892, in Spain.

The International Congress of the Geographical Sciences will meet in Berne on July 10, 1891, and sit till August 15, participating in the 700th anniversary of the founding of the city.

M. de Nolhac, who is a lecturer at the École des Hautes Études, read at the meeting of the Academy of Belles-Lettres on the 26th of October an account of an unpublished and hitherto unknown work of Petrarch's that he has lately discovered in a manuscript belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale. Petrarch's unfinished book, 'De Viris Illustribus,' written in Latin and taken for the most part out of Roman history, is well known. M. de Nolhac's discovery reveals an earlier essay of his in the same general direction. It contains thirteen wholly new biographies drawn from the ancient history of the East and from Greek mythology. This collection shows that Petrarch began the 'De Viris' on a different plan and on a much wider scale than that which he adopted in the end. Besides the new biographies, the book has a long preface in which Petrarch explains the aim of his work and the method he has followed in the use of his authorities. This preface, M. de Nolhac thinks, throws much new light on historical study in the fourteenth century, and points out Petrarch as a precursor of the Orientalists of a later time.

We learn that in attributing the revision of the biographical dictionary in the new 'Webster' to the original compiler, we gave credit where none was due; the revision, which was done with unusual care and painstaking, having been made by Mr. A. P. C. Griffin of the Boston Public Library.

—Mr. C. Alexander Nelson writes us from New Orleans:

"The American Publishers' Association's 'little comedy of swindling,' as Mrs. Richards calls it in the *Nation* of the 6th, is not confined to ladies in Maine. They have attempted to foist two un-ordered copies of their book upon me by sending them C. O. D. by express. I enclose a copy of their last cry for help. Evidently they do not consider the books of sufficient worth to order them back and pay the express charges. I wonder if they suppose natives of the Pine Tree State (of whom I have the honor to be one) are more gullible than other people?"

—Among the illustrated holiday books of the year are two from the fertile pencil of George Wharton Edwards. 'Certain Sonnets by Sir Philip Sidney, Kt.' (Cleveland, O.: The Burrows Brothers Co.) is a collection of Sidney's verses, not all sonnets by any means, from the 'Arcadia.' The other is Austin Dobson's 'Sun-Dial' (Dodd, Mead & Co.). The two books are much alike, and both show Mr. Edwards's great cleverness in the purely decorative part of the work, while the illustrations proper, reproduced by some one of the "photogravure" processes from drawings in mixed wash and line, are unsatisfactory in direct ratio to their importance. The artist's draughtsmanship is weak and capricious, and his figure-pieces are seldom more than pretty, and not infrequently are lamentably ill-drawn and disjointed. His tendency to "take his own where he finds it," or rather to take whatever he finds that will suit his purpose, also crops out here and there. Dodd, Mead & Co. send us also, under the somewhat infelicitous title of 'The Haunted Pool,' George Sand's 'Mare au Diable,' illustrated with fourteen etchings by E. Rudaux, which are delicate and pleasing, but somewhat overfinished and lacking in character. So far as one can judge without critical comparison with the original, the translation by Frank Hunter Potter is well done and fairly successful in rendering the manner of the book, though its simplicity seems more markedly of purpose in English. The volume will prove a very acceptable holiday gift. Another of the books of the season of far more than an average degree of merit is the 'Selection from the Sonnets of William Wordsworth' (Harper & Bros.), with illustrations by Alfred Parsons. The drawings, many of which are republished from *Harper's Magazine*, are sometimes elaborately delicate in rendering of botanical detail, always accurate, workmanlike, and thoroughly respectable, if somewhat prosaic. The inspiration which Wordsworth himself does not always show, though more often, perhaps, in these sonnets than elsewhere, is lacking, but we should be thankful for serious and sound drawing of landscape, which we cannot often get in book-illustration. Mr. Parsons's few figure drawings are less successful. The printing is good, the paper heavy, and the binding permanent. Everything considered, it is a book to be recommended.

—The prolific letter H reckons its second instalment in Vol. 24 of Leslie Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan), and still does not get beyond the first vowel of the alphabet (Hailes–Harriott). In accordance with British admiration for Handel, this composer occupies the greatest space (14 pp.); but his biographers are candid both as regards his originality and his rank in the development of music. It almost seems inharmonious to have the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour cited for the most temperate and critical discussion of the charges of plagiarism against Handel. John Hampden gets 12 pages, King Harold 8, Sir Matthew Hale and Lady Hamilton 7, Bishop Hall, Halley, Halliwell-Phillipps, and Sir William Hamilton about 5 each. Among the throng of Hamiltons one might have expected to find that born British subject, Alexander Hamilton, not less than Judge Haliburton ("Sam Slick") or Charles G. Halpine ("Miles O'Reilly"). American interest is further involved in the notices of Basil Hall, the precursor of Mrs. Trollope, and Marshall Hall, discoverer of the reflex action of the *medulla oblongata*, who combined philanthropy with medical science, and produced, as a result of his travels in this country, a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work on the 'Two-fold Slavery of the United States.' Another celebrity, Jonas Hanway, remembered chiefly for the moral courage which made it "good form" to carry umbrellas in the streets, was a philanthropist of no mean order, yet violently opposed to the naturalization of the Jews; and so voluminous a writer that a mere list of his works fills two pages. The inventor of the Hansom cab appropriately keeps him company in this volume. Thomas Hancock, the English Goodyear; Chester Moor Hall, inventor of the achromatic telescope; James Hargreaves, who gave us the spinning-jenny; and Robert Harrild, who made an enormous contribution to the diffusion of knowledge by substituting composition rollers for the ancient balls with which types were inked, are again names which should be kept in mind. Harrild was also in ordinary ways a public benefactor, and it was he who preserved the printing-press now in the Patent-office at Washington, on which Franklin worked as a journeyman in London. No great literary name distinguishes this volume, or called for treatment at the hands of the senior editor.

—When the *Critic* obtained, by a small post-office ballot, a list of forty favorite American authors—all men—we found some interest in analyzing the list, in respect to birthplaces and local habitations. The result showed that, in the estimate of the readers of a New York periodical, New England yet held its own to a remarkable degree, under both these tests. It may be worth while to make a similar analysis of a corresponding list of women authors lately obtained from the same quarter. We have relied mainly on Mr. Arthur Stedman's "Short Biographies" in the "Library of American Literature," vol. xi., and on Mr. W. M. Griswold's 'Directory of Writers.' It is to be noted, however, that some of the names on the list were evidently selected on other than literary grounds, and the result of the balloting has on the whole a rather boarding-school flavor. The whole number of votes is stated to have been 275 "or more," bestowed as follows: Harriet Beecher Stowe, 268; Frances H. Burnett, 241; Mary N. Murfree (*Charles Egbert Craddock*), 215; Julia Ward Howe, 204; Elizabeth Stuart Phelps Ward, 203; Sarah Orne Jewett, 193; Mary Mapes Dodge, 182; Constance Fenimore Woolson, 149; Edith M. Thomas, 146; Margaret Deland, 142; Adeline D. T. Whitney, 125; Celia Thaxter, 123; Amelia E. Barr, 123; Lucy Larcom, 118; Rose Terry Cooke, 104; Mary Abigail Dodge (*Gail Hamilton*), 102; Harriet Prescott Spofford, 97; Louise Chandler Moulton, 97; Mary E. Wilkins, 96; Blanche Willis Howard Teufel, 84; Mary Hallock Foote, 78; Margaret J. Preston, 75; Sarah Chauncey Woolsey (*Susan Coolidge*), 73; Louise Imogen Guiney, 69; Margaret E. Sangster, 68; Martha J. Lamb, 67; Rebecca Harding Davis, 64; Alice French (*Octave Thanet*), 62; Mary Virginia Terhune (*Marion Harland*), 60; Frances E. Willard, 56; Harriet W. Preston, 54; Mary A. Livermore, 53; Agnes E. Repplier, 52; M. G. Van Rensselaer, 52; Kate Field, 51; Frances Fisher (*Christian Reid*), 49; Helen Gray Cone, 47; S. M. B. Piatt, 47; Elizabeth B. Custer, 37; Elizabeth B. Stoddard, 31.

—The analysis of birth and residence is as follows: *Birthplaces*—(Mass.) Ward, Whitney, Larcom, M. A. Dodge, Wilkins, Guiney, Lamb, French, H. W. Preston, Livermore, Stoddard, 11; (N. Y.) Howe, M. M. Dodge, Foote, Sangster, Willard, Van Rensselaer, Cone, 7; (Conn.) Stowe, Cooke, Moulton, Woolsey, 4; (Pa.) Deland, M. J. Preston, Davis, Repplier, 4; (Maine) Jewett, Spofford, Teufel, 3; (N. H.) Woolson, Thaxter, 2; (England) Burnett, Barr, 2; (Ohio) Thomas, 1; (Tenn.) Murfree, 1; (Va.) Terhune, 1; (Mo.) Field, 1; (Ky.) Piatt, 1; (N. C.) Fisher, 1; (Mich.) Custer, 1. *Residences:* (Mass.) Howe, Ward, Jewett, Deland, Whitney, Thaxter, Larcom, Spofford, Moulton, Wilkins, Guiney, Livermore, 12; (N. Y.) M. M. Dodge, Thomas, Barr, Sangster, Lamb, Terhune, Van Rensselaer, Field, Cone, Custer, Stoddard, 11; (Europe) Woolson, Teufel, H. W. Preston, 3; (D. C.) Burnett, M. A. Dodge, 2; (Conn.) Stowe, Cooke, 2; (Pa.) Davis, Repplier, 2; (Miss.) Piatt, Willard, 2; (Mo.) Murfree, 1; (Va.) M. J. Preston, 1; (Iowa) French, 1; (R. I.) Woolsey, 1; (Idaho) Foote, 1; (La.) Fisher, 1.

—The attention which "General" Booth's panacea for abolishing poverty is receiving gives a timely flavor to Prof. A. G. Warner's excellent paper on "Experiments in Behalf of the Unemployed," in the last issue of the Harvard *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. The Booth scheme is for the transportation of great numbers of the city poor to agricultural colonies, in the country or beyond sea, where they may have healthful work and the chance of independent support. The idea is not novel, but the actual experiment on a great scale would be, and it is therefore pertinent to ask what the smaller experiments of the sort have amounted to. Prof. Warner's paper gives some attention to the Provident Wood Yards which have been tried in some of our cities, but is chiefly concerned with the laborers' colonies of Germany and Holland. The German experiments have been tried on a considerable scale since 1882. There are twenty-one colonies, with accommodations for 2,500 laborers at a time; and a total of 36,000 persons have been admitted to them since the start. The inmates are given work, chiefly farm labor, and the object is to train them to become independent and self-supporting. The success has been of the most moderate sort. A few of the colonists graduate into independence, but the majority continue to be what they were before—tramps. Indeed, a regular class of bummers has grown up "who go from colony to colony, with brief periods of wandering freedom between dismission from one and admission to the other." A very large proportion of the colonists are ex-convicts, and Prof. Warner notes that the work of the colonies corresponds largely to that done by our Prisoners' Aid Associations. The Dutch experiments have been of a different sort. In the laborers' colonies of Holland, the poor are planted permanently on considerable tracts of land, and removed for good from the ordinary competitive struggle of life. After an apprenticeship as laborers on model farms, they are made tenants of small plots on easy terms, with an outfit given. The results are less unsatisfactory than those of the German scheme, for these manufactured farmers maintain themselves with at least an appearance of thrift. But they are not entirely self-sustaining; the experiment as a whole, which is in charge of a State-aided association, needs regular charitable support; and, most striking of all, the number of colonists established tends to decline rather than increase. Our own impression is that Prof. Warner gives a rather more favorable account of the operations than the history of the Dutch experiment warrants; but at best the story does not inspire hope that the colonizing scheme will prove the long-sought panacea against poverty.

—It would not be surprising if the success of the new systems of balloting suggested by the Australian law should give an impetus to another reform originating from the same remote source—the registration of titles. Nor is it surprising that a movement in this direction is beginning to make itself felt in Massachusetts, a community that seems to be quite as progressive as any of its sister States. The customary practice of recording deeds grows more and more cumbersome, and, after all, as Lord Cairns said, "It only puts on a formal record all that multitude of deeds and conveyances of the extent and complexity of which we have already so much reason to complain." The principal merit of the Australian system is declared by Sir Robert Torrens, its originator, to lie in the avoidance of "the accumulation of instruments with voluminous indexes." Under this system the landowner may, by proving his title before the registrar, obtain a certificate from the State that he is the owner in fee, and thereafter the land thus registered cannot be conveyed by deed. The certificate operates as a State warranty of title, being conclusive evidence in any court. Sales and mortgages are conducted in much the same way that we now effect transfers of shares of stock in corporations. While it may be admitted that this system is extremely simple and inexpensive, and that it gives great security of title, it should not be forgotten that a considerable portion of the existing fabric of credit rests upon the law of liens upon real estate. Creditors will not be hasty in approving a law that will enable a man to convert his land into cash at an hour's notice; and it may be argued that a sound business policy requires that some form of property should exist which can be converted only after such delay as will afford some opportunity for creditors to secure their claims. The matter of proving titles, too, in an old community is a serious obstacle. The subject is too complicated to be fully considered here, but it can do no harm to suggest to the advocates of the reform that they will promote their cause by a careful and even sympathetic consideration of the objections that will be raised, even though many of these objections emanate from the selfish opposition of vested interests.

ADAMS'S ADMINISTRATION OF MADISON.—I.

History of the United States of America during the First Administration of James Madison. By Henry Adams. Charles Scribner's Sons. 2 vols. 1890.

It is no fault of Mr. Adams that the earlier portion of this history, at least so much as covers events prior to the declaration of war with England in 1812, should be less interesting than his former volumes devoted to the Administration of Jefferson. Madison was essentially a "closet statesman," and as an executive officer and political leader he must be accepted as a much less imposing figure than the Sage of Monticello and Apostle of American Democracy. It must be confessed, moreover, that the stream of our national life flowed over the flats and shallows of much helpless and hopeless irresolution from the beginning of Madison's first term down to the eventful day when, on the 18th of June, 1812, the nation plunged into the tempests of an unknown sea—into a war of which nobody could foresee the consequences.

A narrative history of the successive phases under which our diplomatic and political vacillations appear, disappear, and reappear in this long period, is likely to be tedious just in proportion to the minuteness and fidelity with which the story is told. The monotony of the British aggressions on our commerce, committed under color of the Orders in Council, and the monotony of the similar aggressions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

committed by Napoleon under color of his Imperial Decrees, are exceeded only by the monotony of the counter-proceedings with which the Government of the United States vainly sought some way of escape from the devouring maw of one monster without rushing into the open jaws of the other—an alternative choice of evils which the nation was obliged to make, because it evidently was not equal to the task of grappling with both monsters at once. The legislation and the diplomacy of the country during the whole epoch were involved in a mesh of uncertainties, and presented a painful object-lesson in confirmation of that fine saying of Bacon, that "truth emerges sooner from error than from confusion." The country for long and weary years had not enough of pith or purpose to venture on the hazards of any affirmative policy, lest haply that policy should prove to be a blunder, and so continued to flounder in a slough of despond without the courage to draw resolution from its despair, and without seeking to find correctives for its imbecility in the possible mistakes of positive action in any given direction. The Government rested in a practical state of unmasterly inactivity, or rather, we should say, in a state of diplomatic and political see-saw as it librated between the English Cabinet and the French Emperor. If this libration was not the greatest mistake of all, it was at least likely to be regarded as the mark and sign of a discretion which transcended valor. In England and France it was sneeringly charged that the United States was shielding itself behind the coward's insensibility to insult.

Mr. Adams gives us a very exact description of all these perplexities during the period when the more the medley of our politics changed, "the more it was the same thing," to use the oft-quoted phrase of the French wit. The difficulties of the situation are naturally reflected in the difficulties of the literary art which is called to hold up its mirror to these dissolving views. But for this reason Mr. Adams does not shirk the duty of the faithful historian as he discloses to us the subsidence of faction at the beginning of Madison's Administration; the brief alienation from France which, in 1809, was for a time so full of promise to the Federalists, and which created for Madison a popularity as transient as it was delusive; the seeming concessions of Canning, as he trod with uncertain steps "among the slippery and ill-balanced stepping-stones" of the British *via mala;* the ill-omened arrangement of Erskine, concerted in neglect of his instructions, with its consequent disavowal by the British Government; the brief diplomatic career of "Copenhagen" Jackson, brought to such a dramatic close by an insolence which had at least the merit of being in keeping with *his* instructions; the triumph of Napoleon as, fresh from the bloody field of Wagram, and with his foot on the neck of Austria, he launched the Decree of Vienna, which sequestered at will every American ship that came within his military control. At this stage of Mr. Adams's narrative we are landed in the heart of the plot which awaits its slow dénouement in the subsequent pages of this history.

It was universally felt in the United States, at least among the Republicans, that the disavowal of Erskine's arrangement "had capped the climax of British atrocity." But now it was that the insolence of Napoleon came to put a fresh affront on the honor and rights of the nation. Yet the double-headed aggression did but set in stronger relief the executive weakness and the legislative impotence which it served to explain. Without were fightings and within were fears; for Madison's Cabinet had been handicapped from the beginning with the incapacity of Robert Smith, the Secretary of State, while the anti-Gallatin faction, in the Senate and press, was working at perpetual cross-purposes with the Administration it professed to support on the lines of a Republicanism more Republican than that of Madison himself.

Mr. Adams does not blink the difficulties of the situation created for Madison by causes beyond his control, but evidently thinks that the evil of the situation was intensified by Madison's incapacity to deal with the duties and trials of executive administration. Everybody will admit, as has been already implied, that Madison is seen at his best in the mild wisdom with which he always sought to arbitrate among interfering claims of opinion or inclination in the forum of civil debate, rather than in the high and quick resolve which plucks the flower safety from the nettle danger. But, after all due allowance made for the defects of his qualities, the average reader will sometimes wish that the historian could have looked with as much complacency on the bright side as on the "seamy side" of the character and conduct here described.

At the threshold of the story it is charged that Madison, in his inaugural address, made use of conventional speech in order to conceal, rather than reveal, his thoughts; that "the resemblance between him and a cardinal" was not imaginary, because he could bide his time in supplanting a friend who was in his way; that if his fame as a statesman should rest on what he wrote as President, he would be thought "among the dullest of men"; that he had "a feminine faculty for pressing a delicate point" in matters of controversy; that the "unfailing note of his mind was irritability without passion"; that he was "always treated by his associates with a shade of contempt as a closet politician," and "paid surprisingly little regard to rules of consistency or caution"; that, though "doubtless a man of veracity," he risked statements in the matter of the alleged revocation of the French decrees in 1810 which he had every reason to believe were fallacious, and which he continued to reaffirm after everybody in England had detected their falsity, and after everybody in America who was willing to confess the truth could but "laugh in his face" for the pertinacity with which he clung to the French legend. Such "pertinacity" was entirely in keeping with Madison's character as portrayed by Mr. Adams. He says that Madison, though never carried away by bursts of passion, "was fretful rather than vehement, pertinacious rather than resolute." It is admitted that this pertinacity sometimes served him a good turn, as when, for instance, it caused "the pliable nature of Monroe" to succumb to executive dictation soon after that statesman entered the Cabinet of Madison with views very different from those he was made to support.

As to the much-mooted topic of the alleged revocation of the French Decrees in 1810, on which the whole policy of the Administration was subsequently made to hinge, we do not purpose to hackle anew the well-beaten straw which Mr. Adams passes through the sharp teeth of his threshing machine. That straw was beaten with a thousand flails on the threshing-floors of English and American diplomacy at the period in question. It is not necessary to inquire what Napoleon really meant to say when he directed the Duc de Cadore to acquaint Armstrong, the Minister of the United States, on the 5th of August, 1810, with the following intelligence: "I am authorized to declare to you that the Decrees of Berlin and Milan are revoked, and that, after November 1, they will cease to have effect—bien entendu qu'en conséquence de cette déclaration les Anglais révoqueront leurs Arrêts du Conseil, et renonceront aux nouveaux principes de blocus qu'ils ont voulu établir; ou bien que les États-Unis, conformément à l'acte que vous venez de communiquer, feront respecter leurs droits par les Anglais."

Whether this latter clause, which we have preferred to cite in the French original rather than in Mr. Adams's translation, was meant to signify a "condition *precedent*" or a "condition *subsequent*"; whether the revocation of the French Decrees, declared to be actual in the first clause, imposed at once an obligation on the English Government to recall its Orders in Council, since the latter were "retaliatory" on the former; or whether that Government might properly wait till the 1st of November to see if the Decrees would really cease to have effect at that date—that is, whether the interval between August 5 and the 1st of November was meant to serve as a *locus penitentiæ* for France and England, while serving as a stumbling-block for the United States—all these are questions which, for the nicety of their terms, may be said to rival the famous distinctions between the question *de fait* and the question *de droit* which once figured so largely in the controversy waged between Jesuits and Jansenists over the 'Augustinus' as it *was*, and the 'Augustinus' as it was *understood* in the Monastery of Port Royal. Mr. Adams, we observe, omits to mention that the disputed clause, in the shape given to it by the Duc de Cadore, differs in phraseology from the minute of the note as preserved in the 'Correspondance de Napoléon I.,' at the opening part of its twenty-first volume, and differs in a way which would have made it impossible for Madison to commit the mistranslation ascribed to him.

It is not difficult to perceive the sense in which Cadore's words were understood by Armstrong in Paris, by Pinkney, our Minister, in London, and by Madison in Washington. And it is not difficult to perceive that the words were, on their face, susceptible of the meaning given to them by the American authorities, and that Madison may have been honest, if over-credulous, in presuming that the words were meant to signify what they imported instead of being a trap set for him by the French Emperor. It is true that, in accepting the words as an immediate and prospective revocation of the Decrees, and in promptly acting upon that understanding, he pierced himself through with many sorrows, and was betrayed into a diplomatic position which he felt to be most uncomfortable, and which was made doubly uncomfortable by the slings and arrows of the Federalists. In his judgment on the case, Mr. Adams sides in these volumes with the Federalists and the British Cabinet; but in his excellent 'Life of Gallatin' we understand him to be less censorious on the same showing of facts. In that Life he says (p. 461) that "the diplomatic mistake [made by Madison] did not affect the essential merits of the case, and the factiousness of Congress merely prevented the possibility of a peaceful solution [of pending questions with England]. Neither the one nor the other offers the smallest evidence of inconsistency in Mr. Madison or in his Cabinet."

The duplicity of Napoleon in the premises cannot be overstated. In close connection with the foregoing statement in his Gallatin biography, Mr. Adams remarks that while "there is reason to regret that Mr. Madison should have made himself so eagerly the dupe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Napoleon," yet it still remains to say that "the good faith of the American Government cannot be called in question." Cobbett, we know, wrote from his Newgate prison a frank defence of the American position in this matter, though it is not cited by Mr. Adams. The best exposition of the American contention is undoubtedly that found in the despatch of Pinkney to Lord Wellesley under date of December 10, 1810. For nice analysis of documentary evidence that paper has rarely been surpassed. Mr. Adams finds the argument of Pinkney "not easy to understand." We have read it, and find it quite intel igible. We find no paradox in Pinkney's logic, and therefore cannot concur with Mr. Adams's suggestion that the American diplomatist thought his argument would produce the stronger impression the more paradoxical it was. As his ground for this suggestion, the author says that in 1810 "centuries of study at Oxford and Edinburgh, and generations devoted to the logic or rhetoric of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, had left the most educated classes of Great Britain still in the stage of culture where reasoning, in order to convince, must cease to be reasonable." We know that the study of Greek and Latin has been held responsible for much mischief, but we had not supposed that the case was quite so bad as Mr. Adams hints.

In assessing the measure of blame that should be visited on the Government of the United States for its vacillations in the critical matter of declaring war against England in 1812, it seems to us that Mr. Adams is both more happy and more just in the judgment he pronounces under this head in the same Life of Gallatin to which we have already referred. He there says that Madison had been ready in 1808-9 "to throw forward the flag of the country," if only he could be assured that "the people would press onward to defend it." "He had urged measures almost equivalent to war," adds Mr. Adams, "in every following session, so far as Congress would allow him to do so. . . . It is not to be denied that his party was far behind him, and that as a consequence the whole foreign policy from February, 1809, to June, 1812, was one long series of blunders and misfortunes" ('Life of Gallatin,' pp. 460-461). If here the blame is properly assessed, it is also properly laid at the door of public sentiment. If even the Republican party was not ready for war, what shall be said of the Federalists, who, when the war came, were well-nigh ready to take sides, argumentatively at least, with the public enemy? As early as 1809 the Governor of Connecticut, when asked to assist with the State militia in the enforcement of the embargo, had declined a compliance with the request, because the Embargo Act "interfered with the State sovereignties," while the Legislature of the State affirmed it to be the duty of the State authorities "to watch over the powers not delegated to the United States, but reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

London Street Arabs. By Mrs. H. M. Stanley. Cassell & Co. 1890.

MRS. HENRY M. STANLEY'S graceful little book, consisting of a dozen pages of introduction and about two-score of wood-engravings from her drawings, all preceded by a portrait of herself, falls in very happily with the spirit of her husband's more extensive work. It proves that Mrs. Stanley also is in her own way an adventurous and persistent explorer of phases of life almost as unknown and as dark as those in "darkest Africa" itself.

Mrs. Stanley, under her maiden name of Dorothy Tennant, has long been well known to many circles of society on account of her several gifts and graces. She was at once recognized as the original of one of Sir John Millais's most popular pictures, called "Yes or No?" with which almost every one is familiar through engravings. Her beauty was also celebrated on canvas by the eminent painter of so many of England's famous men, Mr. G. F. Watts. But her best title to lasting reputation Miss Tennant earned for herself by her faithful and touching delineations in oil of the manners and habits of the little waifs and strays of stony London deserts. Hitherto, however, only the fortunate few who frequent the London picture exhibitions have been able to make acquaintance with Mrs. Stanley's portrayal of street Arab life. It is pleasant, therefore, to welcome this first venture of hers in book form, and doubly pleasant to be let by her into the method and secret of her work.

The secret of her success is, after all, no other than the time-honored one of patient industry. The best recipe she knows, for instance, for learning to draw babies is, she tells her readers, "to go out for a walk, determined to shut your eyes to everything but babies. For half an hour study the average of babies' arms; then take the average of mouths and noses—the way their pinafores get huddled up—the way their socks run down into their heavy little laced boots, etc., etc." To coax a small ragamuffin as model into a studio requires, according to Mrs. Stanley, a large expenditure of "time, eloquence, and sixpences." The ragamuffin is shy about venturing into unfamiliar precincts, and is besides an excitement-loving elf, so that after he is caught he must, if he is to be kept, be well entertained. Mrs. Stanley's piano grew prematurely old under the thumping fore-fingers of ragamuffins whom she was successively forced to teach how to strum "God Save Our Gracious Queen." She may surely be pardoned for vigorously denying that her piano could play any other tune besides.

In return for her pains, Mrs. Stanley not only finds that "the more you look the better you draw," but also that

"the little model always interests or amuses you. He tells you true stories and makes deep observations; he confides in you and wishes to please you; so that after a while you find yourself attached to Tommy Jones, or Freddy Scott, and you confide *in him*, and even consult him, his opinion of your work being by no means to be despised, since he frequently improves the picture by suggesting modifications in the attitudes."

The drawings which form the chief part of this delightful little volume, are executed in an admirable spirit of realism. Only very occasionally does a touch of sentimentalism give a more conventional character to a sketch, or has a hackneyed vein of pathos been indulged, the latter principally in the case of the Italian-eyed little musician who gazes hungrily and despairingly into a cheap eating-house window (we hope it is not without intention that the man in the background is in the act of putting a hand into his trousers-pocket), and who reappears on another page in a desolate garret, trying to warm and comfort a small sister. But as a whole the pictures are full of originality. The street Arab leaps and plays on Mrs. Stanley's pages with an ease and abandon to be seen nowhere else off the pavement which is at once his nursery, his school-room, and his playground. He is instinct with life and motion and animal spirits. Mrs. Stanley knows every turn of his head, every line of his supple little body. Nor is it to be supposed that it is only the male Arab of the street who here finds himself perpetuated in black and white. The bare-legged, shock-headed little girl is to be seen sharing with her brother in the delights of the kerbstone. More often, it is to be noted, she exhibits signs of thoughtfulness beyond her years, gazing reflectively at the baby she is minding, or pinning a shawl closely about the head of a shred of humanity still smaller than herself. Sometimes, however, she throws herself with all her soul into the unexpected chance of a swing or a hilarious dance to the tune of a hand-organ.

The engraver has not done his work as well as might have been wished and as the artistic merit of the pictures deserves. But the prints, whatever may be their shortcomings as to workmanship, are eminently humanizing in their effect. No one, after looking over them, can ever again be quite blind to some of the pictures that meet the eye on almost every walk in a large city, nor to the deep pathos of the lot of the almost unfathered and unmothered children of the "submerged tenth." Mrs. Stanley's insight into the nature of the ragamuffin is rare and unusual, but the springs of pity and sympathy she touches are fortunately common to all.

By Leafy Ways: Brief Studies from the Book of Nature. By Francis A. Knight. Illustrated by E. T. Compton. Fourth edition. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1890.

Idylls of the Field. By Francis A. Knight. Illustrated by E. T. Compton. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1890.

THESE two idyllic volumes by an English lover of English nature differ from those to which our American descendants of Thoreau have accustomed us by being wholly free from any meditative strain, any sophistication of the intellect, any intrusion of self-consciousness of the Concord stripe. They are most direct in their method, and show an author contented to use his eyes, and to tell us over and over again what he has seen of the life of birds and the little beasts of the field and river, and the beautiful changes of atmosphere and sea in which these have their being. Indeed, Mr. Knight almost overwhelms the reader's attention by the multitude of minute facts of mere vision which he records, and he is never tired of repeating that the air is warm and the sky is blue, the swallows flying and the plover calling, so that the "perpetual miracle" of nature is as constant with each of his chapters as it is with each of his mornings. This abundance of detail and unceasing freshness of pleasure in it makes the books little fitted for continuous reading. The sketches were originally written for the *Daily News*, and hence have a unity each by each which they lack when strung together. The reader, too, is wearied by the unfortunate affectation of rhythmical sentences and the recurrence of paragraphs so short as to make the page resemble chapters of Biblical verses. With these drawbacks, however, our criticism ends; in the substance of the work is an immense information about English wild-nature, and this is given with so true a love of the living things, and so fine an eye for landscape, and besides with so much real poetical feeling, that the books are treasure-trove to the initiated. The newest of the volumes, 'Idylls of the Field,' is more definite and ordered and more localized, the Devon coast taking in it the place that the Norfolk Broads hold in the first; and once the story leaps to Germany. Birds are the principal subject, and after them the seacoast, and morning and evening. If any one would know the elements of beauty in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foggy island, he cannot do better than seek an introduction through these sketches; but he must have something of the poet's soul.

Over the Teacups. By Oliver Wendell Holmes. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1890.

THE literary recreations of Dr. Holmes in his age keep the old lines in which he pleased an earlier generation of readers, and he is still mainly the poet and the talker. The present volume follows, as naturally as the years themselves, its predecessors, with a full circle about the table whose conversations found nearly forty years ago so fortunate a reporter, and whose occasional poems were received with a general welcome. Those who were most attracted by the earlier books of the Autocrat in his various changes of character, have no doubt already made acquaintance with these last papers, to which we have referred as they appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and have found in them the same discursiveness, happy sayings, and acute remarks, mingled with the new reminiscent flavor which is a marked trait of Dr. Holmes's later writings. There is the same slight thread of a story serving to bind into something like continuity the fragments of essay and discussion; and none of the old leading interests—the physician's, the poet's, the quasi-theologian's—are missed from the pages. The sign of the new age is occasionally stamped on the topic, as in the paper on the delights of a socialistic and altogether equal state of life on a neighboring planet; but the treatment is that of which the success had already been assured. Of the new poems none is likely to be remembered longer than the "Broomstick Train," in which the reader recognizes the peculiar characteristics of the author's muse, and sees that it was written with real interest and remarkable vivacity of mind.

In the book, it is felt, Dr. Holmes means rather to greet his old readers, and to keep companionship with them to the end, than to appeal to the tastes and hearts of the new generation; and this feeling is enhanced by the intimacy with which he opens himself to the sympathies of his audience. Nor does he now lay down the pen, but promises to continue his occasional observations, sure of a welcome which does not wear out.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Abbot, W. J. Battle Fields and Camp Fires. Dodd, Mead & Co. $3.
About, E. L'Homme à l'Oreille Cassée. William R. Jenkins. 60 cents.
American Boys' Manual of Practical Mechanics. Dick & Fitzgerald. 50 cents.
Babyland. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.
Balzac, H. de. The Chouans. Cassell Publishing Co.
Bolognesi, P. R. Il Mio Poema. Florence: Le Monnier.
Bray, S. Alice. The Baby's Journal. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. $1.50.
Bruglère, Sarah Van Buren. Good Living. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Bunner, H. C. "Short Sixes." Keppler & Schwarzmann.
Cady, Annie Cole. Worthington's History of the United States. Worthington Co. 50 cents.
Castlemon, H. Rodney the Partisan. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.
Codman, J. The Question of Ships. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 25 cents.
Cope, R. The Distribution of Wealth. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $2.
Coues, E. "A Woman in the Case." Boston: The Occult Publishing Co.
Dale, A. An Old Maid Kindled. G. W. Dillingham.
Detlef, C. A. Russian Country House. Worthington Co. 50 cents.
Dickinson, Emily: Poems. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.50.
Dobson, A. Four Frenchwomen. Dodd, Mead & Co.
Du Croquet, C. P. First Course in French Conversation, Recitation, and Reading. William R. Jenkins. $1.
Durham, W. Astronomy: Sun, Moon, Stars, etc. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 50 cents.
Eaton, Frances. Dollikens and the Miser. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Electricity in Daily Life. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.
Etheridge, Mary Lee. Mrs. Muff and Her Friends. Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co.
Eytinge, Rose, and Fisher, S. Ada. It Happened this Way. United States Book Co.
Farrar, C. S. Art Topics. Chicago: Chas. S. Farrar & Co.
Fenn, G. M. Cutlass and Cudgel. Brentano's. $1.50.
Flammarion, Camille. Urania. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. $3.50.
Fletcher, C. R. L. Gustavus Adolphus. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Fox, L. A. Evidence of a Future Life. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society.
Fuller, Mabel Louise. In Poppy Land. Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co.
Gautier, L. Chivalry. George Routledge & Sons. $2.50.
Gibbens, H. de B. Industrial History of England. London: Methuen & Co.
Glazebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. Vol. II. London: Percival & Co.
Haggard, H. R., and Lang, A. The World's Desire. Harper & Bros. 35 cents.
Heimburg, W. A Sister's Love. Worthington Co.
Higginson, T. W. The Works of Epictetus. New ed. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Houssaye, H. Cleopatra. Duprat & Co.
Houston, E. J. A Dictionary of Electrical Words, Terms, and Phrases. The W. J. Johnston Co.
Hugo, V. Les Travailleurs de la Mer. William R. Jenkins. $1.
Ingersoll, E. The Silver Caves. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.
Jacobs, J. English Fairy Tales. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Knight, W. Essays in Philosophy. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Kobbé, G. Wagner's Life and Works. 2 vols. G. Schirmer. $3.
Knox, T. W. Horse Stories. Cassell Publishing Co.
Kurz Isolde. Phantasieen und Märchen. Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen.
Locke, D. R. The Demagogue. Boston: Lee & Shepard.
MacDonald, G. The Golden Key. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. 35 cents.
McKay, F. E. Vignettes: Real and Ideal. Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co.
Mahaffy, Rev. J. P. Greek Pictures Drawn with Pen and Pencil. New York: Fleming H. Revell. $3.20.
Malot, H. Sans Famille. William R. Jenkins. $1.25.
Maupassant, G. de. Pierre et Jean. Chicago: Laird & Lee.
Mersereau, W. T. Vesper Bells. New York: Privately Printed.
Molière. Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme. D. C. Heath & Co.
Molière. Le Tartuffe. D. C. Heath & Co.
Moorehead, W. K. Wanneta, the Sioux. Dodd, Mead & Co. $2.
Morris, W. News from Nowhere; or, An Epoch of Rest. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places.$2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

S. B. LUYSTER,

98 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK, AND LONDON, ENGLAND,

Importer of Standard English Books, OLD AND NEW.

Catalogues issued bi-monthly, and sent gratis to any address, on application.

FRENCH, GERMAN, - - - - SPANISH, ITALIAN.

You can, by ten weeks' study, master either of these languages sufficiently for every-day and business conversation, by Dr. RICH. S. ROSENTHAL'S celebrated MEISTERSCHAFT SYSTEM. Terms, $5.00 for books of each language, with privilege of answers to all questions, and correction of exercises. Sample copy, Part I., 25 cents. Liberal terms to teachers.

MEISTERSCHAFT CO., 299 Washington St., Boston.

ELLIS & ELVEY,

29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, ENGLAND,

Dealers in Choice Books and MSS.

Catalogues issued periodically and forwarded regularly to purchasers. Early illuminated MSS.—XVth Century Books, with woodcuts—Horæ on vellum—Fine bindings—Rare Americana, etc., etc.

EUROPEAN WINTER AND SUMMER Resort, University town of Innsbruck, Tirol' Austria; 1,900 feet above the sea, with dry, bracing climate. Hotel Tirol, open all the year, Carl Landsee, Proprietor. Large, airy, sunny rooms, well furnished. Elevator. Superior cuisine (table d'hôte or à la carte). Reduced rates in winter. Carriages and sleighs at low rates. Charming excursions made from the hotel at all seasons. Unusual advantages for securing teachers of the languages, history, science, art, music, etc., at very moderate terms. Eminent medical care and skilled nurses if desired. Best English and American references. Illustrated pamphlets sent on application.

". . . *But she will make every reader wish to be a follower.* . . . *Her enthusiasm of exploration and discovery is contagious. And so her book becomes dangerous, for its awakening of longings which for the most of us it must be impossible to gratify.*"—Literary World.

UP THE NILE.

By AMELIA B. EDWARDS, Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., etc. With upwards of seventy Illustrations engraved on wood by G. Pearson, after drawings by the author. Revised edition, with fresh Notes. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

"*Under her magic pen the ruins hum with busy life, blossom with color, and echo with chant or dirge. The latest revelations of the spade, and the identifications, readings, and interpretations of scholars, are set before us in abundance. The secrets of chronology, and the reasons why the Egyptians were so different from us as well as from the Greeks and Hebrews, are set forth in a few words, as only the facile expert can set them forth. In addition to the notes, which will be 'nuts' to the scholar and reader seeking solid information, there is the narrative, lively, piquant, full of fun, and eminently readable.*"—The Critic.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR, AND UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

Untrodden Peaks and Unfrequented Valleys

A Midsummer Ramble in the Dolomites. Revised edition, with Illustrations and Maps. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

"*It is quite a treat to fall in with this bright, breezy record, in every line of which we seem to hear the ring of that cheery laughter wherewith its author greets every new mishap of the road, meeting scanty food, hard quarters, noise, dirt, rain, bad roads, the buffeting of mountain storms, and the stupidity of mountain peasants, not as a direct personal injury to be avenged by persistent ill humor, but as a kind of rough practical joke, rather exhilarating than otherwise.*"—New York Times.

*** *For sale by all Booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of the advertised price, by the Publishers.*

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, Limited,

9 LAFAYETTE PLACE, NEW YORK.

MEMORIAL TABLETS

Of all Descriptions. Send for Circulars.

J. & R. LAMB, 59 Carmine St., N. Y.

Cleopatra, *A Study from the French* of HENRY HOUSSAYE.

1 vol. 16mo, $1.00. DUPRAT & CO., 849 5th Ave., New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED